

Spring 5-2014

The Effects of Leadership and High-Stakes Testing on the Retention of Teachers

Amy Krohn Thibodeaux
University of Southern Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thibodeaux, Amy Krohn, "The Effects of Leadership and High-Stakes Testing on the Retention of Teachers" (2014). *Dissertations*. 7.
<https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/7>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

The University of Southern Mississippi

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP AND HIGH-STAKES TESTING
ON THE RETENTION OF TEACHERS

by

Amy Krohn Thibodeaux

Abstract of a Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2014

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP AND HIGH-STAKES TESTING
ON THE RETENTION OF TEACHERS

by Amy Krohn Thibodeaux

May 2014

The purpose of this study was to examine whether principal leadership behaviors and the demands of high-stakes tests had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Perceptions of teachers concerning the contributing factors that led to their intent to remain in the teaching profession were also examined. Factors included in this study were examined by the researcher in an effort to gain knowledge of what leads to teacher job satisfaction in the teaching profession.

The researcher used a quantitative survey instrument with a qualitative component. The survey instrument was created by the researcher and consisted of seven sections. Sections included teacher demographic questions, Likert-scale perception questions which addressed principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention questions, teacher job satisfaction questions, teacher mentoring questions, intrinsic motivator questions, and five open-ended questions. Open-ended questions were found in the final section entitled self-reported factors. The survey instrument was distributed to K-12 teachers in public schools in south Mississippi. These state-measured and non-state-measured subject area teachers taught at elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools.

When looking at overall quantitative data, the results of this study indicated that principal leadership had an effect on whether teachers would remain in the teaching

profession, confirming what the literature said. In examining whether there was a difference in the levels of teacher job satisfaction between teachers of state-measured subject areas and teachers of non-state-measured subject areas, there was not a significant difference found, contradicting previous scholarship in this area. Analysis of data also suggested that there was a significant relationship found between teacher job satisfaction, teacher morale, and teacher mentoring programs with regard to teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. The findings on teacher job satisfaction supported previous literature.

Overall analysis of data for the qualitative component supported quantitative data in most areas. Although both quantitative and qualitative data supported the relevance of principal leadership on teachers' intent, when teachers responded to open-ended questions relative to principal leadership some answers varied compared to the responses in the quantitative section on principal support. Additional qualitative data indicated three things that most influenced teachers to remain in the profession: student success, subject matter taught, and the art of teaching. When asked which factors contributed greatest to teachers leaving the profession, teachers responded with lack of administrative support, teacher workload, and student discipline. Additional self-reported factors that were bothersome to teachers were student discipline, as previously noted, excessive paperwork, and pressures of state-testing. Teacher responses are supportive of previous literature in the area of teacher retention. Based on the findings in this study, the researcher developed recommendations for policy, practice, and future studies.

COPYRIGHT BY
AMY KROHN THIBODEAUX
2014

The University of Southern Mississippi

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP AND HIGH-STAKES TESTING
ON THE RETENTION OF TEACHERS

by

Amy Krohn Thibodeaux

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

David E. Lee

Director

J. T. Johnson

Myron Labat

Leslie Locke

Maureen A. Ryan

Dean of the Graduate School

May 2014

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my family, and I thank God for giving me the strength to complete it. Everything I do in life is for the betterment of my family, and I am proud that God put all of you in my life. To my husband Gerry, your support is immeasurable. Although you were already a Mr. Mom, you sharpened your skills and became the primary cook around the house. You encouraged me to pursue my dreams from the day we were married. I could not have made it this far without your encouragement and love.

To Garrett and Annie, I regret the time that I spent away from you while working toward this degree, but I thank you for encouraging me and for accompanying me to USM for my dissertation defenses. I will cherish those memories for life. Although this is a big achievement for me, my greatest accomplishment in life is being a mother to both of you. Garrett, I love you with all of my heart, and I am looking forward to sharing a May 2014 graduation with you. Thank you for being a great big brother to Annie while I worked at night on my dissertation. I need you in my life, and I will always treasure our time together. Annie, you have supported me non-stop along the way. I can remember driving you to school, and you would say, “Mom, when are you going to start writing your dissertation, so you can be Dr. Thibodeaux?” You always inspire me. I love how you reach for the stars and go for what you want in life. I cherish every moment with you. Your determination to make it in the world makes me proud. I love you!

To my parents, from the time I was a little girl, you encouraged me to strive to be the best that I can be. My goal in life is to make you proud! I love you, and the best gift you ever gave to me was a normal, healthy, and happy childhood. For that, I will always be grateful. I look forward to spending time with you during our next trip together!

To my sister Delia, I thank you for watching my children throughout the years and for loving them like your own. You have a heart of gold!

To my brother Wade, I thank you for being proud of me and for sharing my good news with others. You accomplished much in your life, and that makes me proud of you!

To my sister Glenda, I thank you for always loving my children! You have a good heart, and I hope to always encourage you to fulfill your life and dreams.

To my sister Beth, your help with numbers, making copies for me, being a taxi for my children, or feeding them on nights when I was not home will always be appreciated! You are a great person, and I love you for being a great sister to me.

To the Thibodeaux family, you hold a special place in my heart.

To Marlene, I first met you through my parents, but you quickly became my friend, too. You helped me tremendously in the beginning, and you encouraged me to make it to the end. I am proud to call you Dr. Marlene Pickard, proud to call you my friend, and proud to wear your gown on this special graduation day. Love you!

To Mike Gulino, your friendship, support, and computer skills are invaluable. I thank you for assisting me in many of my professional goals, including NBPTS and this!

To Dave, Dr. DMax, your stats knowledge blows me away. Thank you for assisting me and for being a supportive friend along the way.

To Wayne Fortenberry, you encouraged and supported me early in this process. To Mr. Arledge, Mr. King, and Mr. Gill, thank you for believing in me and renewing my spirit in the teaching profession. And last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank all of my colleagues and friends (especially the Lechners) who have encouraged me and got me out of the house for dinner or boat rides to the island. I love each of you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Gratitude is a word that I learned early in my life. My parents taught me to thank someone when that person bestowed a gift upon me or lent me a helping hand in my time of need. Therefore, I would like to take this time to thank my wonderful professors for lending a hand, an ear, advice, and most of all, encouragement to me during this past year. Writing a dissertation is not an easy task, and it often makes a person feel as though she is traveling down a lonely road. With the help of my committee, I was able to travel that road all the way to my destination.

Dr. David E. Lee, your encouragement and support guided me in the right direction on more than one occasion. Your bright words of wisdom and cheerful attitude made me want to accomplish all of my goals and more. Without you as my chair, I could not have done this. I will forever appreciate you!

Dr. J.T. Johnson, thank you for your intelligence and your encouragement to “get it finished.” The impact you make on students is profound. When I met you in my last stats class, I knew that you would definitely be my methodologist. Thank for you assisting me and making these numbers mean something to me.

Dr. Leslie Locke, patience is what comes to mind when I think of you. You read, reread, edited, revised, and encouraged me along the way...even before you were a committee member. Your coffee hours and words of encouragement will forever be appreciated. The attention that you give to students is a testament to how great you are.

Dr. Myron Labat, thank you for being a committee member. You are a kind soul and not only did I appreciate having you as an instructor, I appreciate you for being a great committee member. May our paths cross again in the future! Thanks to all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem	
Research Questions and Hypotheses	
Definition of Terms	
Delimitations	
Assumptions	
Justification	
Summary	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	24
Introduction	
Theoretical Foundations	
Two-Factor Theory	
Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs	
History of the Principalship	
Principal Leadership Styles and Behaviors	
Roles and Responsibilities of Principals	
Teacher Mentoring	
Highly Qualified Teachers	
High-Stakes Testing	
State-Measured and Non-state-measured Subject Area Teacher Roles	
Teacher Retention and Attrition	
Teacher Job Satisfaction	
Intrinsic Motivators for Teachers	
Summary	
III. METHODOLOGY.....	79

	Introduction	
	Research Questions/Hypotheses	
	Research Design	
	Participants in the Study	
	Positionality Statement	
	Instrumentation	
	Procedures	
	Limitations	
	Data Analysis	
	Ancillary Findings	
	Summary	
IV.	RESULTS.....	95
	Introduction	
	Results	
	Descriptive Statistics	
	Hypothesis Results	
	Qualitative Data Analysis	
	Ancillary Findings	
	Summary	
V.	DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	122
	Summary of Procedures	
	Major Findings	
	Discussion	
	Limitations	
	Importance of the Study to the Field of Educational Leadership	
	Recommendations for Leadership, Policies, and Procedures	
	Recommendations for Future Research	
	Summary	
	APPENDIXES.....	150
	REFERENCES.....	168

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Pilot Study Cronbach's alpha.....	89
2.	Teacher Demographics	99
3.	Teacher Setting and Certification Demographics	101
4.	Teacher Characteristics	103
5.	Principal Leadership Behaviors	104
6.	Teacher Intention	105
7.	Teacher Job Satisfaction	106
8.	Teacher Mentoring Programs	107
9.	Intrinsic Motivators.....	108
10.	Descriptive Statistics of Mean Sub-scores.....	109
11.	State-Measured and Non-state-measured Teacher Job Satisfaction	110
12.	Regression Coefficients for Predicting Intent to Remain	111

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the primary challenges in schools today is for all children to receive a quality education from highly-qualified teachers. However, today's schools are faced with the problem of teachers leaving the classroom in pursuit of other opportunities. In a study that was conducted by the National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, about 500,000 teachers in the United States leave their schools, a figure that repeats itself each year (Boyd et al., 2009). Johnson (2006) avows those who have a vested interest in education know that the key to student success is dependent upon having knowledgeable teachers who care about educating students. Fatima (2012) also believes that with efforts in place to improve today's educational standards, having a qualified teacher in the classroom is vital for student growth.

Working relationships between teachers and students often begin in classrooms. It is likely that in order for communities to become educated, teacher-student relationships must flourish. To better nurture these relationships, teachers in schools must have support from stakeholders such as parents, administrators, communities, school board members, and students; furthermore, for learning and quality instruction to occur, stakeholders must make themselves available in order to identify problems in schools and work to resolve them (Strom, Strom, & Beckert, 2011). One problem that exists in education today is that many teachers do not stay in the profession long enough to build collaborative relationships with parents and community members in order to be considered effective in their daily endeavors (Berry & Fuller, 2007). Therefore, the teaching profession should be examined further to understand why teachers flee from classrooms.

The purpose of this study was to examine whether principal leadership behaviors and the demands of high-stakes testing had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Perceptions of teachers, concerning the contributing factors that led to their intent to remain in the teaching profession, were also examined. First, the researcher examined whether principal leadership styles and behaviors affected teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Second, the researcher examined the levels of teacher job satisfaction between state-measured subject area teachers such as those who teach reading, math, and English and those teachers in non-state-measured subject areas such as science, history, technology, and elective classes (e.g., band, choir, art). Third, the researcher examined if there was a relationship between teacher job satisfaction and teacher mentoring with regard to teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Also examined were the leading self-reported factors that contributed to teachers' intent to remain in or leave the teaching profession.

Research suggests that at a time when teachers must carefully examine and master the roles and responsibilities of their profession to meet the needs of children as well as the demands of administrators and policy makers, strains experienced by teachers are resulting in teacher turnover (Valli & Buese, 2007). For some educators, these strains may be caused from high-stakes testing and stressors that are associated with test preparation, procedures, and accountability (Hahs-Vaughn & Scherff, 2008). Such accountability has led to standardization and high-stakes assessment in schools, which is primarily due to the widespread movement of government-regulated mandates in the United States (Rubin, 2011). This movement, which resulted in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, requires teachers of English/Language Arts (ELA) to

administer high-stakes assessments in both reading and writing. Teachers of ELA have become victimized due to the increased expectations and regulations placed on them more so than teachers in other subject areas according to Rubin, 2011. As a result of this, “for teachers today, both in ELA and across the curriculum, NCLB is harming teachers, their practice and their long-term commitment to the teaching profession” (Rubin, 2011, p. 407)

While many teachers claim that responsibilities and workload have increased due to standardized testing (Valli & Buese, 2007), other educators state they merely cannot keep up with the demands of the profession, disrespect from students, abundance of paperwork, and the lack of support they receive from administrators both at the school and district levels (Haberman, 2005). Leithwood and McAdie (2007) suggested when teachers perceive their workload to be imbalanced compared to that of their peers, teacher stress is increased, teacher morale is weakened, and teacher commitment to schools becomes a concern. Leithwood and McAdie indicated:

When the overall number of pupils for which they are responsible becomes excessive, when the size of their classes is perceived to make unreasonable demands on the time required for preparation and marking and seriously erodes the opportunities for providing differentiated instruction for their students. (p. 10)

Because of dissatisfaction in schools, teacher movement becomes a concern for districts with high turnover rates. Hahs-Vaughn and Scherff (2008) suggested that “teacher turnover can exist in the form of either (a) attrition (teachers leaving the profession, or leavers) or (b) mobility or migration (teachers changing schools, or movers)” (p. 23). Similar to Hahs-Vaughn and Scherff’s (2008) beliefs on teacher

turnover, Ingersoll and Smith (2003) stated that *attrition* includes those teachers who leave the teaching profession altogether, while migration refers to those who transfer to other schools. Attrition occurs in many types of schools and districts and may not only be common with novice teachers but also with veteran teachers. Although there seems to be a concentrated effort by some administrators on retaining novice teachers and providing mentoring and induction programs for them, the effort to retain veteran teachers often goes unnoticed (Day & Gu, 2009). While many veteran teachers invest numerous years in the teaching profession, years that contribute to retirement, the thought of investing further into retirement may not always be enough to keep a teacher in the profession if the teacher is experiencing burnout or job dissatisfaction. Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, and Malone (2006) suggested:

Teacher's self-efficacy beliefs do not operate in isolation from other psychosocial determinants that affect their motivation and performance such as their professional aspirations, the recognition and respect they perceive to be accorded and ultimately, the satisfaction they draw from their profession. (p. 475)

When teachers perceive their workload to be excessive, job satisfaction becomes a problem, and teachers are more likely find a job in another profession (Leithwood & McAdie, 2007).

In meeting the demands of high-stakes testing, Byrd-Blake et al. (2010) suggested many teachers in state-measured testing areas such as reading, English, and math may be experiencing more frustration compared to those who teach in non-tested subject areas such as science or history. This is true both in the elementary and secondary grades due to increased expectations by administrators and state mandates to rush instructional

objectives in anticipation of standardized tests (Byrd-Blake et al., 2010). Byrd-Blake et al. (2010) further proclaimed that tested subject area teachers have increased feelings of negativity toward NCLB. Teachers are faced with increased expectations to produce test scores, spend more time planning instructional lessons, and attend more professional meetings that include the disaggregation of data; all of which reduce a teacher's morale and commitment to his or her school (Leithwood & McAdie, 2007).

Finnigan and Gross (2007) went so far as to say that when teachers see low test scores posted, this can increase teacher stress and frustration levels which can result in discouragement, job uncertainty, and a desire to leave the teaching profession. Due to their desire to outperform neighboring schools and districts, Wills and Sandholtz (2009) suggested that some administrators may magnify their expectations of what can and should be done to increase student achievement. Perhaps these expectations are at the expense of teachers' time and their ability to keep up with the demands of the ever-changing curriculum and methods of instruction.

General concerns from teachers may include a lack of consideration from administrators regarding the amount of extra work they place on teachers. Teachers are faced with increased pressures as a result of NCLB (2001) due to the high-stakes tests that have been implemented, especially those teachers of language arts who are responsible for high student achievement on reading and writing tests (Rubin, 2011). Additionally, teachers could face frustration when they feel as though they have little or no opinion in matters involving their day-to-day routines and little or no mentoring from those more experienced teachers and leaders. If teachers are leaving the profession at disconcerting rates, when accountability in schools is more prevalent than ever, then

stakeholders such as communities, institutions of higher learning, policy makers, school boards, superintendents, and principals should realize that they might need to take a closer look and examine what they can do to persuade teachers to remain in the field.

Statement of the Problem

Approximately 25% of teachers who enter the teaching profession leave within the first three years (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). The problem in education today is that many educators are exiting the profession because test accountability and stringent teaching standards cause teachers to be dissatisfied with the profession (Kohn, 2000). Sawchuk (2012) noted that many school principals fail to encourage effective teachers to remain in schools. Retaining highly qualified teachers in both elementary and secondary schools is an essential challenge for district leaders (Perrachione, Petersen, & Rosser, 2008). The purpose of this study was to examine whether principal leadership behaviors and the demands of high-stakes tests had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Perceptions of teachers concerning the contributing factors that led to teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession were also examined.

In today's world of academic accountability, teachers are held to higher standards and are expected to challenge and motivate all students in their learning endeavors. Mancuso, Roberts, and White (2010) noted that student learning is negatively affected when teacher attrition is prevalent in schools. Ingersoll (2001) and Darling-Hammond (2003) established that schools, which experience high rates of teacher turnover, have less than desired student achievement results. Furthermore, this may indicate that high teacher turnover rates could be due to problems that have gone unnoticed within the school. According to Mancuso et al., (2010), of the potential problems within a school,

the three most frequent responses of teacher dissatisfaction were “poor school leadership, dissatisfaction with salary and personal circumstances” (p. 307) which contributed to poor morale among school teachers.

Jacobson (2007) found that teachers expressed dissatisfaction due to excessive meetings, time-consuming paperwork, lack of planning time, and shortage of teaching supplies. As found in previous studies by Ingersoll (2003) and Darling-Hammond (2003), teacher retention appears to be an ongoing problem in public schools. According to Chapman and Green (1986) and Grier and Holcombe (2008), schools are faced with the concern of finding and retaining qualified teachers. As noted in Chapman and Green’s study, many college students are not interested in the teaching profession. Furthermore, those quality teachers who do currently teach are more likely to leave the teaching profession in pursuit of other opportunities after a few years in the classroom (Scherer, 2012).

Ingersoll and Smith (2003) found that compared to other occupations the teaching profession has a high yearly turnover rate that continues to be problematic for schools and districts. The retention rate of teachers is influenced by the amount of support and empowerment that teachers receive from administrators (Berry & Fuller, 2007). If teachers feel as though they receive an inadequate amount of support from their administrators, then they are more likely to leave (Prather-Jones, 2011). According to a study on teacher attrition and mobility, where approximately 8,400 teachers in the United States were surveyed, almost 40 % of the teachers left their teaching position citing inadequate support from administration as their primary reason for leaving (Marvel, Lyter, Peltola, Strizek, & Morton, 2006).

According to the U.S. Department of Education (2006), in order for schools to provide a quality education, schools must have an adequate amount of teachers who are competent in their fields even though many school districts in the U.S. have not been successful in attaining the number of trained teachers to occupy teaching positions. In an effort to address teacher retention, Perrachione et al. (2008), examined teacher experiences in the classroom and their decisions to remain in the classroom. The information gained from teachers regarding why they stayed in the classroom included self-efficacy, student behavior, and overall job satisfaction; the results of this study provided school districts with pertinent information to promote the retention of teachers. Leithwood and McAdie (2007) claimed “the primary purpose for school structures is to make possible the development and maintenance of cultures that support the work of teachers and the learning of students” (p. 10), thus contributing to a conducive working environment among teachers, administrators, and students.

Because student achievement is considered a direct result of the quality of education a teacher provides, educators are often seen as a primary cause of school failure (Burns, 2007), which may further berate teachers and their willingness to remain in the teaching profession. This is especially true for English teachers as “literacy achievement is a central target for testing in current accountability mandates, (and thereby it seems) literacy teachers and English teachers are particular targets for scrutiny” (Burns, 2007, p. 123). When looking into the issues of improvement of student achievement as a whole, it is vital to find and retain quality English teachers who are both qualified and competent in their field. To better prepare students for high-stakes exams and college entrance exams, English teachers face tremendous stress (Hancock &

Scherff, 2010). As noted by the Center on Education Policy (2009), not all states require exit exams for students. Of the twenty-four states whose students must take mandatory exit exams, students are required to test in reading or English and may also be required to take a writing test. All of these mandatory exams do not, however, require the testing of science or history. The stress from high-stakes tests that is placed upon English, reading, and math teachers further explains why state-measured subject area teachers could be less likely to remain in the profession than teachers of non-state-measured subject areas.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions were addressed throughout this study:

1. Is there a relationship between principal leadership styles and behaviors and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession?
2. Is there a difference in the levels of teacher job satisfaction between teachers of state-measured subject areas and teachers of non-state-measured subject areas?
3. Is there a relationship between teacher job satisfaction, teacher morale, and teacher mentoring programs and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession?
4. Is there a difference between self-reported factors that contribute to teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession?

Hypotheses

The following related hypotheses were examined in this study:

H1: There is a statistically significant relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher morale, teacher satisfaction, and teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession.

H2: There is a statistically significant difference between state-measured subject area teachers' and non-state-measured subject area teachers' intent to remain in the profession.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions presented here were used to clarify the meaning of words that were used throughout this dissertation study:

Accountability - Delivering results in the classroom- showing student growth and achievement (Mississippi Department of Education, 2010).

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) - Moving toward a goal of progress; identifying the starting point for student performance on a previous state assessment and comparing it to yearly progress made by students with the goal of all students reaching the proficient level (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

A Nation at Risk - A study that generated reform in U. S. schools, where all children are entitled to a fair education regardless of race, class, or economic status. This report renewed the nation's commitment to education and included accountability in schools for the goal of improving student achievement and preparing students for the workforce (U. S. Department of Education, 1983).

At-risk Student - A student who is likely to fail or drop out of school based on school failure (National Center for Education Statistics, 1992).

Attrition - Teachers leaving the teaching profession (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003).

Burnout - The emotional exhaustion of teaching stressors and failure that a teacher may feel during the course of a teaching career (Clement, 2000).

Common Core State Standards (CCSS) - A state-led initiative coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The standards were developed in collaboration with teachers, school administrators, and experts to provide a clear and consistent framework to prepare our children for college and career readiness no matter where a child lives or attends school. CCSS present students with knowledge and skills in grades K-12, so they will graduate high school and be ready to succeed in college classes or workforce training programs (Common Core State Standards, 2013).

Delegation - The process of administrators giving tasks to others in the school and allowing others to make decisions (Ward & Wilcox, 1999).

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) - This federally funded act was passed in 1965 and emphasized high standards and equity in education for all children.

Empowerment - Providing teachers with the opportunity to lead and make decisions that may influence teaching practices, policy, and procedures in schools (Berry, Fuller, & Williams, 2007).

Equity - Fair treatment in the workplace (LaMorte, 2008).

Framework - The basis for district curriculum development for K-12 teachers. The framework provides an outline of objectives that students should master in K-12 classrooms. The purpose of the curriculum framework is to provide Mississippi teachers with a structure for planning and delivering instruction in a comprehensive and logical form (Mississippi Department of Education, 2013).

High Poverty Schools - These schools serve low-income students. High-poverty is determined by the number of students receiving subsidized meals at a particular school. Some studies considered high-poverty schools as having 90% or more of students being eligible for free and/or reduced lunch (McKinney, Berry, Dickerson, & Campbell-Whately, 2007; Reeves, 2000).

Highly Qualified Teachers - Teachers who hold a bachelor's degree and/or demonstrated knowledge/certification in all subjects they teach (Smith, Desimone, & Ueno, 2005).

Intrinsic Motivator - A feeling that comes from within a person to be motivated to accomplish something; not being motivated by external rewards (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Leadership - Those leaders who serve as principals or administrators in some capacity; leading others to follow and making an impact on an establishment by making specific goals that represent the vision of the establishment (Berry & Fuller, 2007).

Leaver - A teacher who leaves the teaching profession (Hahs-Vaughn & Scherff, 2008).

Low-Income Students - Those students who qualify for subsidized lunch (Jensen, 2013; Marks, 2012).

MCT - Mississippi Curriculum Test- This exam was the precursor to the MCT2- Mississippi Curriculum Test 2nd Edition. It measured student achievement in Language Arts and Mathematics in grades 3-8 in Mississippi. It was the basis for state accountability prior to the implementation of the MCT2 (Mississippi Department of Education, 2013).

MCT2-Mississippi Curriculum Test 2nd Edition - An exam that measures student achievement in Language Arts and Mathematics in grades 3-8 based on the 2006 Mississippi Language Arts Framework- Revised and 2007 Mississippi Mathematics Framework- Revised, now includes 5th and 8th grade science. It is the basis for state accountability; the MCT2 is designed to meet federal testing requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001) (Mississippi Department of Education, 2013).

Mentor - An experienced teacher who guides a less experienced teacher, along a career path such as the teaching profession (Zimmerman & Paul, 2007)

Migration - The movement of teachers; those who move to teaching jobs in other schools (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003).

Morale - The level of well-being that an individual or group is experiencing in reference to their work life (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002).

Mover - A teacher who changes or moves to different schools (Hahs-Vaughn & Scherff, 2008).

M-Star Evaluation - Mississippi Statewide Teacher Appraisal Rubric (M-Star) is the new evaluation tool to be piloted in the 2013-2014 school year. This evaluation process is designed to improve the performance of teachers in public schools in Mississippi. It consists of five domains which include multiple measures to evaluate teachers and identify their areas of strengths and weaknesses. The domains are Domain I: Planning, Domain II: Assessment, Domain III: Instruction, Domain IV: Learning Environment, and Domain V: Professional Responsibilities (Mississippi Department of Education, 2013).

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) - National Board standards are based on a set of standards that define the specific knowledge and expertise teachers from different subject areas use to develop their practice and enhance teacher pedagogy. The National Board seeks to elevate the status, voice, and role of accomplished teachers in shaping a true profession. Teachers who commit to the process become known as National Board Certified Teachers. The standards are based on five core propositions, which were developed by teacher committees and education experts. The five core propositions include the following:

Proposition 1: Teachers are committed to students and their learning.

Proposition 2: Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.

Proposition 3: Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.

Proposition 4: Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.

Proposition 5: Teachers are members of learning communities. (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2013, para 3)

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) - Federal K-12 education reform that was passed in 2001 under the leadership of President George W. Bush- the purpose of the statute for both assessments and accountability is to build on high-quality accountability systems and to implement rigor in the curriculum as well as to have highly qualified teachers in classrooms. The goal is for all students to score proficient or advanced by 2014 on high-stakes assessments. For example, a Mississippi student who took the seventh grade language arts assessment would fall into one of the following categories: minimal 109-137, basic 138-149, proficient 150-167, or advanced 168-189. State and local leaders want to see student growth and achievement each year on the state assessment, so that all students meet the required growth of proficient or advanced by 2014 (NCLB, 2001; Mississippi Department of Education, 2013).

Novice Teachers - Teachers with three or fewer years of teaching experience (as cited in Kumi-Yeboah & James, 2012).

Policy Makers - Those who hold elected positions on the local, state, and national levels and vote on items that pertain to education and educational policy in schools (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2003).

Principals - Those who guide and lead teachers and students by shaping a vision for academic success of all students, creating a climate hospitable to education, cultivating leadership in others, improving instruction, and managing people, data, and processes to foster school improvement (Wallace Foundation, 2012).

Recruitment - An effort to acquire the number and type of people necessary for the present and future success of the school district by developing employment conditions, salary levels, and benefits that will attract the best applicants (Rebore, 2011).

Retention - An effort to keep quality teachers in the teaching profession (McKinney, et al., 2007).

Revolving Door - The hiring and rehiring of teachers in schools that experience difficulty in retaining teachers; hiring someone to take the place of someone who left with the process being repeated (Prout, 2009).

School Culture - The environment in which schools shape particular values, beliefs, and feelings; it can have a positive or negative influence on a school's effectiveness (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Self-Efficacy - The belief in one's ability to be successful at a given task (Bandura, 1993).

Subject Area Testing Program, 2nd Edition (SATP2) - Assessments that are given to students in Algebra I, Biology I, U.S. History, and English II. Students earning a high school diploma must pass all four subject-area tests to meet graduation requirements. Standards for high school graduation shall include

student “mastery of minimum academic skills as measured by assessments developed and administered by the State Board of Education” (Mississippi Department of Education, 2013).

Stakeholders - Those who have a vested interest in a school district or a particular school within the district. Stakeholders include parents, community members, school board members, policy makers, administrators, teachers, and students. (U.S. Department of Education, 2009)

Teachers - Those who hold a highly qualified certification and teach in a K-12 school (Mississippi Department of Education, 2013).

Teacher Burnout - A pathological syndrome suffered by teachers and caused largely by the conditions (organizational and of many other types) in which teaching takes place (Manassero et al., 2006).

Teacher Induction Program - A program that offers activities for beginning teachers (those with three or fewer years of teaching experience) that supports, trains, and assesses them; this program is a tool to increase retention (Hahs-Vaughan & Scherff, 2008).

Teacher Job Satisfaction - This is the level of gratification a person feels toward a job and the nature of work. Job satisfaction pertains to the work environment, leadership style, culture of the organization, and relationships among colleagues (Fatima, 2012).

Teacher Stress - It includes a range of emotions such as anger, rage, aggression, irritation, frustration, disappointment, and anxiety. A term used for “negative emotions of teachers that are reflected in aversive demands of their work” (Vandenberghe & Huberman, 1999, p. 53).

Teacher Turnover - Major changes in a teacher’s placement from one school year to the next. It can include attrition, migration, or transfer of a teacher from one subject area to another certified area (Boe, Cook, & Sunderland, 2008).

Title I School - A school that receives supplemental funding from the U.S. Department of Education to meet the needs of at-risk and low-income students. Title I funds are used to help bridge the achievement gap between low-income students and other students. Schools with poverty rates above 40 % may use Title I funds. With the implementation of NCLB, schools must make AYP on state testing in order to receive funds (U.S. Department of Education, 1969; Mississippi Department of Education, 2013).

Veteran Teachers - Experienced teachers who are usually considered to have five or more years of experience in the teaching profession (Day & Gu, 2009).

Working Conditions - The favorable or unfavorable conditions in which teachers work; the conditions may influence teacher performance positively or negatively which, in turn, may influence students’ learning conditions (Leithwood & McAdie, 2007).

Delimitations

This study sought to investigate teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession in public schools serving students in grades kindergarten through twelfth. Districts with approval of superintendents and principals included five school districts located in south Mississippi. Most of these schools are located in an area of Mississippi where many teachers' salaries are among the highest in the state. Therefore, higher salaries could have influenced the intent to remain in certain districts despite working conditions. Delimitations for this study included the following:

1. All participants were current teachers in a school district serving elementary, middle, or high school students in south Mississippi.
2. Both state-measured and non-state-measured subject area teachers completed the survey.
3. Participants in this study were limited to those completing a survey only.
4. Attrition rates were not collected for this study. Instead, teacher perceptions were collected in order to determine which factors contributed greatest to teachers' intent to remain in the profession.
5. The study only pertained to teachers who currently teach; therefore, perspectives of those teachers who have already left the profession in the surveyed districts could have provided the researcher with pertinent information that may have contributed more to the reliability and validity of this study.

Assumptions

The following assumptions guided this research:

1. The researcher assumed that principals or school designees gave surveys to their teachers.
2. The researcher assumed that all participants understood the directions and the survey questions.
3. The researcher assumed that participants were open and honest in providing accurate answers for the purpose of this research.

Justification

The teacher shortage in U.S. public schools has caused much concern from school officials as well as policy makers. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) (2007), teacher attrition is a key indicator of the teacher shortage in U.S. schools. During the 2003-2004 school year, 8% of teachers left the teaching profession in pursuit of another profession while another 8% transferred to a different school (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). Although 8% does not appear to seem troublesome, it is a growing concern because the percentage of teachers leaving the profession is increasing. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2003) found that nearly half of all new teachers leave the teaching profession within the first five years. Between 1988 and 2008, most teachers in U.S. schools had approximately fifteen years of classroom experience, a number that has now decreased to one or two years of classroom experience (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2010). Flynt and Morton (2009) claimed the teaching shortage impacts the quality of education a child receives, and educational leaders and

political leaders are aware of the problem. Therefore, it is vital that school leaders seek ways to improve the retention of teachers.

The researcher completed a study in the area of teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession in order to better understand the contributing factors that were associated with teacher job satisfaction and teacher job dissatisfaction. This was completed in an effort to identify the primary factors that contribute to teachers leaving or remaining in the teaching profession. These teacher perceptions provided the researcher with information that could improve teachers' intent to remain in this profession. This research study sought to understand whether teachers in state-measured subject areas were more prone to leave the teaching profession compared to those who teach non-state-measured subject areas; the study also examined principal leadership styles and behaviors and their impact on teacher intent. District administrators both at the building and district levels will benefit from the findings of this study in order to better support all teachers in the future, regardless of years of teaching experience and subject matter.

The potential benefits included, but are not limited to, the scope and sequence of better prepared novice teachers, administrative support, and the identification of what teachers consider "fair" practice in both state-measured subject areas and non-state-measured subject areas. Additional results of this study revealed intrinsic motivators such as personal teaching efficacy, job responsibilities, working with colleagues, and working with students that contribute to teacher satisfaction or dissatisfaction. If analyzed by principals, this study could result in collaboration between administrators and teachers which could result in an effort to bolster teacher morale and possibly keep teachers in the teaching profession.

With Common Core State Standards being implemented as well as the upcoming M-Star evaluation tool for teachers in Mississippi, principals and school leaders will be challenged in meeting new expectations posed by federal and state mandates. Because of the complexity of these implementations, principals and students will benefit by retaining qualified teachers who are dedicated to making student achievement a priority in schools. With the collaboration of teachers and principals working together to produce the end result of high student achievement, education will thrive, and communities will likely prosper. In moving schools forward and meeting these guidelines, as well as those posed by NCLB (2001), school leaders must address the problem of teacher attrition (McKinney et al., 2007). As Ingersoll (2003) stated:

From an organizational perspective, employee turnover is especially consequential in work sites like schools, whose “production processes” require extensive interaction among participants. Such organizations are unusually dependent upon commitment, continuity, and cohesion among employees and, hence, especially vulnerable to employee turnover. (p. 148)

Summary

No Child Left Behind (2001) concluded that although teachers are sometimes singled out and hailed as champions on an individual basis, as a group they may have been blamed for ineffectively teaching children in the U.S. (Goldstein & Beutel, 2009). Increased pressures of NCLB have contributed to the decline of teacher morale both in the elementary and secondary levels (Byrd-Blake et al., 2010). What policy makers and the general public should know and realize about the teaching profession is that many teachers work beyond the forty-hour work week in order to accomplish the tasks for

which they are responsible, tasks that are frequently increased (Perrachione et al., 2008). Policy makers need to be more cognizant of the demands they place on teachers because their mandates greatly affect a teacher's daily schedule (Leithwood & McAdie, 2007). High-stakes testing and the need to improve test scores combined with the lack of support from administrators, parents, and students, especially in low or underperforming districts could be a primary cause of teachers leaving the field of education.

In examining what is important to teacher satisfaction, Leithwood and McAdie (2007) found that teachers thrive when the school environment values their input, supports their safety and the safety of students, and sets high expectations for students. Leithwood and McAdie further asserted that the essential purpose for school structures is to provide a support system for the work of teachers and the outcome for students. According to the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013), teachers are the key factor in providing a child with a quality education and have the largest influence on student achievement; therefore, it is important to support teachers in an effort to retain them. Many teachers reported that administrative support and better salaries would encourage veteran teachers to remain in the teaching profession (Mihans, 2009). According to Mihans (2009), if educational leaders are serious about the retention of high-quality teachers, then teacher salaries must be competitive with those of other professions, and principals must create positive environments in which teachers feel supported.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter, the theoretical foundations of teacher job satisfaction as it relates to high-stakes testing and principal leadership behaviors on teachers' intent to remain in the profession and related scholarship were reviewed and discussed. Additionally, the literature included the history of the principalship, principal leadership styles, roles and responsibilities of principals, highly qualified teachers, induction of teachers, roles and responsibilities of tested area teachers and non-tested subject area teachers, high-stakes testing, teacher retention and attrition, teacher job satisfaction, burnout, morale, and intrinsic motivators that persuade teachers to remain in or leave the teaching profession. The literature guided the reader through the overview of theorists such as Frederick Herzberg and Abraham Maslow who were instrumental in developing motivational theories. Furthermore, the literature, expounded upon the challenges that teachers experience as they strive to promote student growth and achievement in the challenging world of education today.

Theoretical Foundations

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 stated that all teachers will be highly qualified within their respective grade and core subject areas by the year 2006. Core subject areas include English, reading/language arts, math, science, history, civics/government, geography, economics, arts, and foreign languages (Spradlin & Prendergast, 2006). Although many subjects are considered *core* subject areas, not all core subject areas have an end-of-the-year state assessment. Therefore, when the

researcher refers to a tested-subject area teacher or state-tested teacher, the said teacher will be considered a core teacher who teaches a state-measured subject area.

With accountability of NCLB at an all-time high, critics believe that school leaders face challenging efforts in reducing the achievement gaps and retaining highly-qualified teachers (Smith & Kovacs, 2011). Due to the existence of educational reform in schools today, teachers are held to higher standards and accountability, and student achievement remains at the forefront of educational priorities (Spradlin & Prendergast, 2006). Because of the focus on higher accountability, which is increasingly compared to past years, administrators are taking desperate measures to insure their schools are meeting the growth and meeting expectations in the eyes of stakeholders and policy makers (Farber, 2010).

Farber (2010) believes that although a majority of schools are meeting or exceeding expectations of accountability, these expectations come at the expense of teachers' time, health, and commitment to the profession. With the continuous pressure to increase student achievement particularly for tested-subject area teachers along with the lack of administrative support, teachers may feel greater stress in carrying out their responsibilities. According to the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013), as a result of this, teachers are citing lower levels of teacher satisfaction, thus contributing to attrition in schools. Findings from the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013) show a 15% decrease in teacher satisfaction since 2009 and a 12% increase in teachers who say they are likely to leave the profession.

To provide readers with relevant information pertaining to teacher satisfaction, which can result in teachers' intent to remain in the profession, the researcher examined

two theories: Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. The first theory examined was Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. According to Herzberg's theory, there are some job factors that contribute to a person's satisfaction on the job while other job factors can prevent dissatisfaction in the workplace. The motivational-hygiene model states that when employees feel satisfied in the workplace, motivation is attained. Employee motivation is gained through recognition, and individuals feel as though they can grow in their profession (Dartey-Baah, 2011). In addition to employee motivators, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) listed the following hygiene factors which are important to job satisfaction: supervision in the workplace, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salaries, company policies, administrative practices, job benefits, and job security. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory demonstrates the importance of why employers need to create working conditions in order to motivate workers and make them feel a sense of fulfillment while at work (Herzberg et al., 1959).

The second theory examined was Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. This theory of motivation is based on Maslow's concept of people being motivated by five essential needs. In establishing the needs that range from basic to self-actualization, Maslow's hierarchy of needs were arranged using a hierarchical pyramid. This pyramid helps humans to look at the stages of their needs. When people's needs are met on one level, they will become motivated to move up to a more complex level.

Two-Factor Theory

In 1959, Frederick Herzberg developed a theory of motivation known as the Two-Factor Theory, also referred to as the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. This theory was

derived from a study of events pertaining to the lives of engineers and accountants (Herzberg, 1987) where participants were asked to report their most satisfying and most dissatisfying work experiences in an effort to determine what leads to job satisfaction (Johnston, 1990). Since the conception of this theory, claimed Herzberg (1987), many studies have been conducted based on the Two-Factor Theory. These studies focused on an extensive range of populations, thus making the Two-Factor Theory one of the most duplicated studies in the field of job attitudes (Herzberg, 1987). According to Dartey-Baah (2011), there are many theories associated with motivation that influence the way establishments manage employees in an effort to motivate them. Because motivating people can be complex, organizations find it difficult to motivate employees for effective performance (Dartey-Baah, 2011).

In examining theories pertaining to motivation of employees, Herzberg's research presented factors involved in producing job satisfaction or motivation for workers. The Two-Factor Theory of Motivation provides an explanation of job factors that are either satisfying or dissatisfying for employees (Dartey-Baah, 2011). Contrary to satisfaction factors were the factors that created dissatisfaction. Since there were two factors involved, Herzberg clarified his concept by stating that job satisfaction is not opposite of job dissatisfaction. According to Herzberg (1987), the opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction, and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job satisfaction (Dartey-Baah, 2011). Herzberg believed that significant work leads to job satisfaction, and the factors that lead to job satisfaction are completely different from those factors that lead to job dissatisfaction.

The motivational-hygiene model states that when employees are provided with challenging yet enjoyable work that allows the employee to achieve great success, then employee motivation is accomplished (Dartey-Baah, 2011). Similar to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg believed that humans were involved with two types of needs. In assessing the needs of people, one set of needs stems from basic biological drives. These needs come from "humankind's animal nature- the built-in drive to avoid pain from the environment" plus the drives that become accustomed to the basic biological needs (Herzberg, 1987, p. 113). Herzberg compared this to a basic need such as hunger. He believed that hunger motivates a person to earn money; therefore, money is a specific drive for that person. When a person fulfills these basic needs and considers work to be significant, according to Herzberg, this can lead to job satisfaction.

The second set of needs, according to Herzberg (1987), "relates to that unique human characteristic, the ability to achieve," (p. 113) and when people experience achievement, they experience psychological growth. Herzberg indicated that the stimuli for the growth needs are tasks that promote growth. For example, in the industrial setting motivation for growth was job contentment (Herzberg, 1987). According to Herzberg et al. (1959), there are several job-attitude factors that are considered motivator factors, and these factors are considered to be intrinsic to the job. Such factors include recognition, achievement, possibility of growth, advancement, responsibility, and work itself. Dartey-Baah (2011) asserted that these factors include the physiological need for growth and recognition, and they contribute to motivation in workers that produces job performance (Herzberg, 1987). Because of the level of motivation that comes with these factors, they are referred to as satisfiers (Dartey-Baah, 2011).

According to Herzberg et al. (1959), of the aforementioned intrinsic factors, the contributing factor leading to job satisfaction is the achievement factor. Herzberg et al. (1959) found that when workers achieve success, their behavior or performance contributes to satisfaction in the workplace and positive attitudes among other workers. This theory is guided by concepts in the teaching profession which relate to teacher satisfaction. Leithwood and McAdie (2007) avowed that to increase teacher satisfaction and contribute to internal satisfaction, teachers should be provided time to work in teams, prepare for classroom instruction, collaborate with colleagues, participate in team decision making, and have access to ongoing professional development.

When examining working conditions in the workplace, the stimuli bringing about “pain-avoidance behavior is found in the job environment” (Herzberg, 1987, p. 113). According to Dartey-Baah (2011), such environmental factors that cause dissatisfaction for workers, include poor lighting, poor ventilation, poor working conditions, low salaries, and poor relationships with supervisors. Factors that are associated with job dissatisfaction are known as hygiene factors or dissatisfiers (Noell, 1976). The hygiene factors are referred to as the “maintenance factors and comprise of the physiological, safety and love needs from Maslow’s hierarchy of needs” (Dartey-Baah, 2011, p. 2). These factors may not be linked to the job itself, but they may be present in the working conditions. For example, in analyzing intrinsic and extrinsic motivators for teachers, Perrachione et al. (2008) found three intrinsic motivators to be an influence on teacher satisfaction and retention. These motivators include personal teaching efficacy, working with students, and job satisfaction (Perrachione et al., 2008). Hygiene factors that are extrinsic to the job include salary, interpersonal relations, supervision-technical, company

policy and administration, job security, status, working conditions, and factors in personal life (Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1987). When these factors are not present in a job, employees can become dissatisfied in the workplace (Herzberg, 1987).

Therefore, it is important for teachers to have supportive working conditions, so they will remain in the teaching profession (Johnson, 2006).

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

In his study of individuals and what motivates them, Maslow (1954) noted that individuals are motivated as a whole rather than just by a part of their bodies. In other words, if a person is hungry, it is not the stomach that is hungry; the person as a whole feels hungry. Maslow affirmed that individuals themselves had needs; body parts such as a mouth or a stomach do not have needs. Therefore, when people experience satisfaction, the feeling comes to the whole individual not just part of their body. When we examine the desires and needs that drive us in our daily lives as individuals, we realize that that these needs are generally a means to an end rather than the end itself (Maslow, 1954). In developing the various stages of needs, Maslow developed a hierarchy pyramid that addresses the needs in order from basic to more complex (Poston, 2009).

Many people spend the majority of their day at work and find it to be a source of great satisfaction, while others find it to be a cause of misery; therefore, it is important to realize what leads to employee satisfaction in the workplace (Herzberg et al., 1959). Employee satisfaction is important if employers want their businesses to be successful, and in order to establish job satisfaction, it is important to know what causes employee stress (Fatima, 2012). Therefore, if employers seek ways to value their employees, organizations will benefit, and employees will drive the performance of a company just

as a satisfied teacher might improve student achievement (Fatima, 2012). In her project to build skills in directors and teachers in an early childhood center, Cannon (2013) found that employers could adapt Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs to suit the needs of their organization in order to produce better employee performance.

When examining Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, the physiological drives are the starting point for the motivation theory (Maslow, 1954). As people move up the pyramid, the needs become complex and include needs such as safety needs, social needs, esteem needs, and the need for self-actualization (Poston, 2009). When employers make an effort to meet the needs of their employees, they often yield more positive results (Cannon, 2013). In Cannon's (2013) study on meeting employee needs, she found that the treatment of employees affects the performance of the company. When employees were treated fairly, they had more positive interaction with their customers. As affirmed by Adiele and Abraham (2013), motivation is a result of individual needs and desires which drive behavior and results in individual satisfaction.

For teachers to make important contributions to the learning environment, they must have the necessary working conditions (Leithwood & McAdie, 2007). In their report on teacher working conditions, Leithwood and McAdie (2007) asserted that internal feelings of teachers determine what teachers do in the classroom, and these feelings are influenced by a teacher's working environment. Cannon (2013) avowed that most teacher needs are ignored by supervisors. In studying early childhood teacher needs, Cannon found that the majority of staff members' most basic physical and safety needs were not being met. Furthermore, Cannon stated that teachers are often said to be

lifelong learners, but in order for them to meet individual or professional growth, their basic needs must be met (Maslow, 1954).

In assessing Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, the following needs are discussed according to Poston (2009): Basic needs which begin with physiological needs such as food, water, warmth, and rest. Included in the basic needs are the safety needs which consist of security and safety. Moving up the pyramid in to the psychological needs are the belongingness and love needs which are comprised of intimate relationships and friends. The next step in psychological needs consists of esteem needs. Esteem needs are the feelings of prestige and accomplishment. The final step in the hierarchical pyramid is the self-fulfillment needs of self-actualization which includes achieving one's full potential and creative activities (Poston, 2009).

According to Cannon (2013), in relating these needs to the teaching profession, basic needs are the physical and safety needs of teachers. An example of a basic need would be for teachers to have adequate space indoors and outdoors, and those spaces should be appropriately equipped. Examples of safety needs for teachers could include employer paid health insurance and working with competent administration (Cannon, 2013). Physiological needs for teachers such as belonging needs and esteem needs include support for teachers such as informative faculty meetings, adequate planning times, and regular communication. Esteem needs include opportunities for building strengths, competence, and mastery in education. According to Cannon (2013), this can be fulfilled through performance reviews, positive feedback, and growth opportunities. According to Poston (2009), the final set of needs, includes self-actualization needs. These needs are met when teachers reflect upon their teaching practice and reach a higher

degree of independence. Those humans who reach the self-actualization stage are generally better in their judgment, more decisive, have a better understanding of right and wrong, and have a better understanding of people, art, music, politics, and philosophy (Goble, 1970).

In summing up Maslow's needs, he asserted that not all humans satisfy their needs before moving up the pyramid. In other words, a person may not fulfill the need for food before moving onto the need for security. Although Maslow asserted that most people have partially satisfied most of their basic needs, some of their basic needs remain unsatisfied, and these unsatisfied needs bare the greatest influence on behavior (Goble, 1970). Maslow (1954) believed that once a need was met, it had little effect on motivation. Moreover, Maslow said that physiological needs were the most important of all needs because humans who lack needs in life would probably feel the need for food more so than safety, love, or esteem. Maslow asserted, "If all the needs are unsatisfied, and the organism is then dominated by the physiological needs, all other needs may become simply nonexistent or be pushed into the background" (1954, p. 37).

History of the Principalship

The 1977 U. S. Senate Committee Report on Equal Educational Opportunity confirms that the most significant person in a school is the principal (Marzano et al., 2005). According to Lynch (2012), school leadership refers to principals in schools and the work they do including being the instructional leader as well as manager, financial planner, and strategic planner. Rousmaniere (2007), however, claimed that teachers were once considered the "instructor and building manager" (p. 7) prior to what is now known as the principalship. While examining the history of principals, Kafka (2009) and Lynch

(2012) proclaimed that principals were once considered managers of schools. In Kafka's research, she avowed that the school principal played the chief role in school reform and that principalship has evolved over the years. In current research pertaining to principalship, today's school principals are often compared to principals of the past, with modern day principals differing in job responsibilities (Mendels, 2012). Kafka found that past principals were expected to address personnel, maintain good school-community relations, order teaching supplies, balance budgets, and ensure a safe learning environment, in addition to teaching pupils; unlike principals today who generally do not teach students.

Rousmaniere (2007) compared how the principalship changed the context of schools throughout the years. Rousmaniere found that at one time students were supervised by teachers in one-room schoolhouses, and now teachers are being supervised by administrators. Pierce's (1935) research indicated that with the growth of cities in the 1830s, school superintendents realized they had to relinquish some of their duties in order to remain effective in their positions. Therefore, superintendents created a new position in schools known as the principalship in an effort to alleviate some of the demands that were placed on superintendents (Pierce, 1935). Consequently, principal teachers in their new roles became the leaders of teachers who were then known as assistant teachers according to Pierce (1935).

In Rousmaniere's (2007) research on the history of school principals, she found that school principals became the connecting source between administrators and teachers in the early 1900s. The rise of the modern principal began in the mid-1800s through the early 1900s (Kafka, 2009). Like Rousmaniere, Kafka (2009) found that schools in the

late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century began to evolve as teachers who once answered to and served their communities either through elected or appointed school boards began to change roles as the principal teacher position was created. As schools grew larger in size and grade levels were created, the first position of “principal teacher” (Pierce, 1935, p. 12) was established. Eventually explained Grady (1990), the principal transitioned from a teacher of students to an instructional leader for teachers. According to Pierce (1935), typically the position was given to a male who also fulfilled clerical and administrative obligations as well as handling discipline, creating schedules for students, maintaining the school facility, taking attendance, and keeping track of school hours. Such responsibilities of this principal teacher led to a more authoritative role according to Kafka. According to Pierce, principals who were typically males were considered primary leaders of schools. The assistant teachers who were typically females were to obey the principal’s directives, protect his reputation, and learn the rules and regulations of the schools (Pierce, 1935).

By 1920, a pivotal movement for the principalship was underway (Pierce, 1935). Pierce (1935) avowed that a national organization of elementary school principals was founded by the Department of Education of the University of Chicago during this time. This department later became affiliated with the National Education Association thus contributing to the power of the modern day principal (Pierce, 1935). By the mid-1930s, 70% of principals in urban elementary schools no longer taught students (Rousmaniere, 2007). New responsibilities for teaching principals, according to Rousmaniere’s (2007) research, included principals acquiring their own offices and supervising teachers. In their supervisory roles, principals gained prestige and power and were able to evaluate,

hire, and fire teachers, thereby further clarifying their authority. According to Rousmaniere (2007), academic qualifications soon became a factor of distinction between teachers and administrators.

By the 1950s, 33% of all states required specific certification for principals according to Rousmaniere's (2007) study. Rousmaniere's research concluded that by the 1960s, administrators had taken on specific roles including knowledge of school finance, school law, curriculum, and building management. These responsibilities, according to Rousmaniere, indicated that principals were no longer considered teachers with good knowledge of school management, but recognized more as leaders with specific knowledge pertaining to leadership. As principal roles shifted, leadership became an important factor for schools to be considered effective (Marzano et al., 2005).

According to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (2007), throughout the twentieth-century, the school principalship shifted toward a more systematic approach that involved scientific research. By the 1970s and 1980s, Kafka (2009) found that principal expectations had increased as a new portion of their jobs included managing federal programs and curricular activities. During this time, Mendels and Mitgang (2013) noted how principals became known as change agents and then later became known as instructional leaders, a term that is still used to describe school leaders today. Since educational reform such as NCLB (2001) and President Obama's Race to the Top's federal grant program became critical components in educational systems, current school leaders face challenges of leading their schools to greater academic levels and are often given the task of motivating teachers and students in order to move schools forward in this world of accountability (Mendels, 2012; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013).

In his research on the responsibilities of principals, Lynch (2012) found that the roles of today's principals are not considerably different from those principals in past years; however, he claimed that the addition of academic accountability for all children, regardless of student abilities, has been a major factor in current principal responsibilities. Kafka (2009) explained that principals have been answering to stakeholders since the mid-1800s, just as they answer to stakeholders today. She further asserted that principal status has remained the same just as it did in earlier days, as principals are still considered to be in the middle of the educational hierarchy. Principals in modern times continue to manage, supervise, and instruct teachers in leading schools to higher levels all while meeting the demands placed on them by policy makers and superintendents (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). Although principals are compensated at a higher rate than teachers, Kafka (2009) affirmed they are limited in their influence by policy makers who dictate how they govern schools in the quest for schools to meet academic growth and achievement.

In an effort to assess change in the principalship, the NASSP Task Force on Principal Preparation conducted a study on the changing roles of secondary principals (NASSP, 2007). The NASSP (2007) study found that today's leaders must be grounded on two principles: leaders must be experts in their fields, and the values they place on their roles are critical in their leadership. The NASSP study found that leaders of the twenty-first century must effectively commit to their jobs, invest time in children, and be committed to the field of education.

Principal Leadership Styles and Behaviors

In this section of the literature review, the researcher discussed principal leadership styles and behaviors. Because there are many leadership styles in current literature, the researcher focused on the most significant leadership styles that pertained to this study. These leadership styles are transformational leadership, transactional leadership, distributed leadership, instructional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership.

Past research conducted on school leadership has demonstrated the effects of leadership on student achievement, and much of the research suggested that there is a relationship between the actions of a school principal and the effect of principal leadership on student achievement (Aydin, Sarier, & Uysal, 2013; Kafka, 2009). For schools to be effective in meeting the needs of diverse learners, leaders must respond to shifting demographics, increased diversity, cultural backgrounds, socio-economic factors, learning abilities, and physical and mental disabilities of the children and families they serve (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). As student outcomes become a primary focus for today's leaders combined with the influx of diversity in schools, McKenzie and Locke (2009) asserted that instructional and transformational leadership are receiving renewed interest in the debate of their efficacy. According to Hallinger (2003), instructional leadership is leadership that focuses on curriculum and instruction with student academic outcomes a top priority of the educational setting. When practiced in schools, instructional leadership and transformational leadership result in productive academic gains (Hallinger, 2003). Transformational leadership is defined as leadership that generates interests of employees, creates a vision in the workplace, and executes change in the workplace for the betterment of the group (Bass, 1991). Because transformational

leadership is associated with producing favorable results beyond expectations such as meeting emotional needs of employees, stimulating employees, or inspiring employees, it is the preferred style of leadership by administrators that could ultimately transform leaders into moral agents (Bass, 1985; Bass, 1991; Burns, 1978; Marzano et al., 2005).

According to Marzano et al. (2005), leadership is a necessary component for success in any institution. The MetLife Survey of the American Teacher: An Examination of School Leadership (2013) found a relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal performance, indicating that teachers who formed satisfactory relationships with their principals were more satisfied than their peers. These findings could contribute to the idea that principals who have quality leadership skills are often believed to be better leaders. Throughout history, good school leadership has been associated with the effectiveness of schools according to Marzano et al. (2005).

In determining the ways leaders conduct themselves, two common styles of leadership as discussed in Marzano et al. (2005) emerged throughout the years: transformational leadership and transactional leadership. The foundation of these theories came from Burns (1978) who distinguished them into specific terms. Transformational leadership was derived as *transforming leadership* (Burns, 1978) and was elaborated upon by Bass (1985). When leaders use this type of leadership, it is believed to stimulate a greater level of thinking in those being led because these leaders encourage, stimulate, and support employees to do better in the workplace for the good of the group rather than for their own personal mission (Bass, 1985; Burns 1978; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Transformational leadership is appealing to followers because this type of leadership allows followers to feel empowered in their schools while seeking guidance

from their leaders (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006) thus, bolstering a sense of self-worth for both leader and follower.

Transactional leadership, also known as (*quid pro quo*) or exchange of favors, is a type of leadership that is defined as exchanging one thing for another (Marzano et al., 2005) and involves motivating and directing followers through appealing to their own self-interest (Bass, 1991). Three terms associated with transactional leadership developed by Bass and Avolio (1994) are management-by-exception-passive, management-by-exception-active, and constructive transactional (Marzano et al., 2005). Management-by-exception-passive (MBE-P) is leadership that intervenes only when something goes awry or standards of accomplishment are not met (Bass, 1991; Sosik & Dionne, 1997), and MBE-P leaders do not monitor situations effectively. The second form of transactional leadership, management-by-exception-active (MBE-A), is leadership that takes action and is considered to be somewhat effective (Sosik & Dionne, 1997). These leaders stay abreast of current situations, set standards, and closely monitor those being led by them; as a result, followers are less inclined to show initiative and take risks (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Marzano et al., 2005; Sosik & Dionne, 1997). The last form of transactional leadership is constructive transaction (CT). This is the most effective and widely used of the transactional leadership styles (Sosik & Dionne, 1997). This type of leader sets goals, articulates clear expectations of desired outcomes, exchanges rewards and recognition for accomplishments, monitors effectively, praises employees upon merit, communicates by providing feedback, and makes suggestions or consults with followers (Sosik & Dionne, 1997). This type of leadership usually harvests the achievement of expected outcomes by its followers (Bass, 1985).

In their pursuit to get things accomplished, transactional leaders may reward followers with incentives such as pay increases, advanced job opportunities, and school recognition (Bass, 1991). However, Bass (1991) asserted that those employees who fail to meet expectations of leaders are penalized. Transactional leadership, which is based on the “transactions between manager and employees” (Bass, 1991, p. 20), has been found to produce mediocre leadership in previous research studies (Jung, 2001; Jung & Avolio, 2000).

Laissez-faire, also referred to as non-leadership, is considered to be the least effective type of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). This type of leader demonstrates apathy, does not take immediate action, and is absent in making a difference. Laissez-faire leaders do not actively engage themselves on issues related to their roles, and they do not emphasize the results of their efforts. Followers tend to have conflict with these leaders, and these leaders are often viewed as unreliable with followers assuming the role of their leader (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Sosik & Dionne, 1997).

According to Spillane (2005), another type of leadership has gained attention throughout the United States. This leadership type known as distributed leadership may also be known as “shared leadership,” “team leadership,” and “democratic leadership” (Spillane, 2005, p. 143). McKenzie and Locke (2014) noted that administrators could expand the leadership capacity at their schools if they distributed leadership among principals and teacher leaders. According to Leithwood and Riehl (2003), to be effective in distributing leadership roles, two of the prominent functions of leadership are guiding people in the right direction and influencing people to share in a vision for the advancement of the institution. According to Spillane (2005), those teachers who share

in leadership roles could provide improvement in schools by sharing their expertise with fellow teachers and sharing in accountability with principals.

The primary focus of distributed leadership is on leadership practice rather than roles, functions, routines, and structures of leaders according to Spillane (2005), and if distributed leadership is to be effective, then the teacher leaders who are distributing leadership must be effective in carrying out their leadership roles (McKenzie & Locke, in press). Effective leaders work with people and establish conditions in the workplace that are suitable for success (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003), and they interact with day-to-day routines and structures such as assessing data and assisting in evaluating teachers (Spillane, 2005). Leithwood and Riehl (2003) further asserted that distributed leaders do not have to be in a formal position of authority; leadership may be represented by many people in a school who have a vested interest in meeting goals in order to make the establishment a better workplace.

Roles and Responsibilities of Principals

The role of the principal serves as a “catalyst for many school conditions” (Leithwood & McAdie, 2007, p. 11) thus, contributing to the quality of the school environment. The principal of a school, whose chief role is to serve as an instructional leader in today’s times, is ultimately held responsible for the academic achievement of students and the progression of school performance (Bouchard, Cervone, Hayden, Riggins-Newby, & Zarlengo, 2002; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Leithwood and Riehl (2003), however, believe that teachers have the most significant effect on student learning while principals are deemed second to teachers. Bouchard et al. (2002) noted that the responsibilities for school principals have changed, and principal roles have

become complex and demanding in nature. Principals are now bound to comply with both national and state mandates that include accountability for student growth and achievement of all students, producing more high school graduates and affording disadvantaged students with increased opportunities for college and career readiness (Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012). Additionally, Leithwood and Riehl (2003) argue that principals are primarily responsible for the effectiveness of teachers and student outcomes on state-mandated tests.

The role as instructional leader, which emerged in the early 1980s (Hallinger, 2003), requires principals to stay abreast of current technology, schedule students accordingly, find appropriate resources for teachers, and respond to ever changing mandates (Bouchard et al., 2002). Instructional leaders think of themselves as facilitators of curriculum, and their primary focus is to improve student achievement (Hallinger, 2003). According to the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013), nine out of ten principals believed that they should be held responsible for everything that happens to children in their schools, and 74% of teachers agree that principals should be responsible. The percentage of teachers who agreed in 2012 revealed a significant increase compared to the 60% of teachers who believed principals should be held accountable in 1989 (MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2013).

A principal's role is directly related to the quality of the school environment and the success of students; and in order for schools to be successful, they must have a competent leader who cares about the well-being of the school (Bouchard et al., 2002). Principals need to be on a mission to develop strong instructional standards, and they must commit to education and invest in their students' academic progress (NASSP,

2007). This increase in focus could be attributed to the fact that teacher accountability is on the rise; therefore, teachers believe those instructional leaders or principals should also be liable for student growth and achievement.

Principals' roles are more complex today, and these roles include a plethora of elements that are crucial to the achievement of all students within a school and to the success of these principals who are often referred to as instructional leaders (Lynch, 2012; NASSP, 2007.) Cooley and Shen (2005) contended that it is nearly impossible for principals to fulfill their roles and responsibilities in today's times due to the excessive demands placed on them. While functioning in their roles as instructional leaders, principals who demonstrated the greatest amount of stress were those who led secondary schools and schools where progress was not met in both English and mathematics according to the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013). Because principals are primarily responsible for the educational aspirations of all students, including those with learning disabilities, it is important for principals to be prepared in meeting instructional demands. In many cases, Lynch (2012) found principals to be unprepared, however. In Lynch's research, he surmised that principals should be adept in managing personnel, budgets, and strategic planning; however, many principals are not ready for the principalship due to lack of preparation through higher education programs for principal leadership.

Lack of preparation and increased academic responsibilities are overwhelming to many principals, (Lynch, 2012) and according to the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013), only 42% of principals claim to have control over curriculum and instruction, making it harder for them to lead instruction. According to Bouchard et al.

(2002), the challenges related to increasing academic awareness and promoting school-wide growth along with public scrutiny and other demands of the principalship appear to be more stressful now compared to past years for principals. Job satisfaction has decreased for principals from 2008 when 68% of principals claimed to be satisfied with their jobs compared to only 59% claiming to be satisfied with their jobs in 2012 (MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2013). With the increase of accountability, stakeholder expectations on the rise, and job responsibilities increasing, principals feel continuous pressure to meet the demands of school reform, thus creating changing roles for principals (Cooley & Shen, 2005).

Cooley and Shen (2005) found that, historically, principals were responsible for balancing budgets and assuming professional relationships with teachers while engaging teachers in instructional leadership methods. Consequently, in today's times of academic accountability, principal responsibilities have shifted to accountability for student achievement, and effective teaching is related to as increasing student growth and achievement on standardized tests (Cooley & Shen, 2005; Gallagher, 2012). Because of the continuous pressure on principals to increase test scores and to show student growth and achievement, the pressure trickles down to teachers (Farber, 2010). In his study on supporting teacher effectiveness, Gallagher (2012) found that teacher effectiveness in today's classroom is defined as increasing student achievement on standardized tests.

As leaders shift the pressure of mandates and school reform onto the shoulders of teachers, the problem of teacher retention becomes a reality (Farber, 2010). NASSP (2007) asserted that in response to accountability of NCLB (2001), principal and teacher relationships have been strained due to teachers being asked to contribute more time and

effort in preparing lessons to meet student growth and achievement, yet many teachers are unprepared to meet the demands because they are not afforded the necessary time to collaborate or the necessary resources for the lessons. To support the evidence of dissatisfaction of principals with regard to teacher retention, it was noted in the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013) that dissatisfied principals found it difficult to maintain rigor in their schools and to retain an ample amount of effective teachers.

In a recent report conducted by the New York City-based The New Teacher Project (TNTP) on teacher-retention decisions, Sawchuk (2012) found that many school leaders neglect to recognize and encourage effective teachers to remain in schools. According to Sawchuk (2012), this lack of encouragement primarily affects schools with low-performing students because those schools often experience difficulty in attracting and retaining good teachers. Approximately one-fifth of teachers as shown by their data to produce significant gains in student achievement were considered to be irreplaceable compared to other teachers in the district claimed Sawchuk (2012), and these 20% of teachers claimed that they would remain at their current school if they had strong leadership who set high academic expectations.

In addressing teacher attrition and the principal's role in schools, Greenlee and Brown (2009) found that teachers leave primarily due to their working conditions and lack of administrative support. Researchers in this field avowed that principals are influential in teacher retention, and in order for teachers to thrive in their professional world, they must be subjected to better working conditions with effective leaders who are competent and concerned for the well-being of teachers (Greenlee & Brown, 2009). According to NASSP (2007), if principals would clarify their instructional goals for

teachers and focus on collaborative relationships to improve instruction and meet instructional goals, teachers would be able to bolster their teaching efforts and meet the needs of children, thereby, creating a better working environment for everyone.

Many efforts have been made over the past ten years to improve principal preparation and build stronger leadership in schools (Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012). Although not all states have aligned their leadership programs with standards-based instruction, 43 states have relied on the use of the 1996 Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders to strengthen their leadership in schools by developing a template for ISLLC standards in their schools (Wallace Foundation, 2008). In using these standards as a guide within their schools, administrators can prepare teachers through induction programs, professional development, and performance evaluation of both teachers and principals. These standards were developed and later updated in an effort to guide and support school leaders in their increasingly complex roles. Standards were also developed to provide leaders with criteria that reflect upon good leadership methods, positive leadership regarding student achievement, and better policies and procedures for school leadership (Wallace Foundation, 2008).

In the ever-changing world of education, principals face more challenges; these challenges include more students, fewer teachers, aging school facilities, decreased budgets, increased violence, and most challenging of all, increased accountability (NASSP, 2007). According to the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013), 75% of today's principals believe that their job has become too complex, and 69% say the complexities of their jobs have changed within the last five years. Figures such as these

indicate the pressures and anxieties that leaders exhibit while trying to fulfill their leadership roles.

Teacher Mentoring

One solution to retaining teachers according to Ingersoll and Smith (2003) would be to provide teachers with mentors, especially those teachers who are new to the profession. Upon entering the teaching profession, many teachers walk into a classroom with little or no support from colleagues and/or administration, and the key to novice teacher support begins with the building principal (Flynt & Morton, 2009). What most administrators may fail to realize is that many teachers are sinking. Kopkowski (2008) cited several reasons for teachers leaving the profession. These reasons include little support from administration and parents, testing and accountability as mandated by federal legislation such as NCLB (2001), lack of respect, inadequate pay, and high numbers of student discipline and infractions.

For many years, public schools have encountered the challenge of hiring new teachers and transitioning them into the teaching profession while assisting them in learning and growing professionally (Ingersoll, 2012; Nielson, Barry, & Addison, 2006). In recent years, greater consideration in helping and supporting novice teachers has been acknowledged by school leaders in an effort to retain them due to the alarming number of teachers who leave within the three years of entering the profession (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). In past years, unlike other professions, teaching has not typically offered quality induction programs that foster new teacher development, thus creating a problem with teacher retention (Ingersoll, 2012). Most professions provide in-depth training to inexperienced employees and use mentors to train them according to

Mihans (2009). Scherer (2012) suggested that novice teachers should have “systematic, intense mentoring in the first year” (p. 18). Because they work with children behind closed doors for the majority of the working day, Ingersoll and Strong (2011) claimed that teachers tend to feel overwhelmed with teaching responsibilities and isolated from their colleagues; being isolated is especially difficult for new teachers who rely on experienced teachers to guide them in daily decision making. In addition to isolation, data indicates that new teachers often leave the profession due to lack of administrative support (Curtis, 2012). Administrators may need to realize that in order to recruit and retain teachers they must be more supportive of teachers on a daily basis.

In comparison to past studies on new teacher support (Ingersoll, 2012; Kang & Berliner, 2012), about 75% of new teachers recently reported that schools supported them by providing helpful mentor teachers and useful induction programs (Scherer, 2012). Additionally, Scherer noted that some states fund mentoring programs by providing substitute teachers for mentors in an effort to maximize the amount of time mentors are able to spend with novice teachers during the school day. Nielson et al. (2006) indicated that induction programs can be successful if they are “highly structured, include mentoring, focus on professional learning, and emphasize collaboration that is broad and focused” (p. 14).

In their research on mentoring, Ingersoll and Strong (2011) identified mentoring programs in various schools that consisted of numerous ways to assist new teachers. Methods included assigning veteran teachers to novice teachers at the beginning of the school year and organizing highly structured programs that include frequent meetings between mentors and mentees that span over two years’ time. Additionally, it was noted

that some schools required mentor programs to all newly hired teachers regardless of teaching experience as a strategy to acquaint teachers with the practices in that particular school. In their research, Ingersoll and Strong concluded that, for the most part, schools focused solely on novice teachers in the area of mentoring with little or no support provided to those teachers with experience in the field.

Having support and effective mentoring from veteran teachers is critical to novice teachers' success and their intent to remain in the teaching profession (Scherer, 2012). In their study on veteran teachers as mentors, Hanson and Moir (2008) identified four areas in which mentoring made a substantial impact on the continuing professional practice of veteran teachers as well as school districts in which mentoring was utilized effectively. These areas include the practice of mentoring to broaden teachers' perspectives of the profession and themselves, mentoring to have a profound impact on pedagogy and student learning, mentoring to develop growth for veteran teachers and promote leadership among teachers, and the mentoring process to support good, quality teaching practices among mentors and mentees; moreover, mentors feel recharged and learn new practices from their mentees that can be used in their own classrooms (Hanson & Moir, 2008).

In a discussion with Darling-Hammond, Scherer (2012) noted that teachers want to be in a collaborative working environment, especially those teachers who are new to the profession. Scherer asserted that teachers enter school environments with the hope of being successful, collaborating with other teachers, and working as a team with teachers who are good at their craft. Scherer also found that teacher education programs recently altered field experiences to collaborate with coursework in order to better fit the needs of

students entering the teaching profession. Therefore, many teachers' programs now provide better classroom experiences in an effort to prepare future teachers for the actual classroom experience. Additionally, Scherer noted that teacher education programs have made an effort to better prepare students for the challenges that lie ahead in the teaching profession such as student lessons that are based around standardized testing objectives and differentiated instruction. Better preparation and assistance from administrators and colleagues through a teacher induction program has become a major focus in school reform (Ingersoll, 2012). The ultimate goal of mentoring and induction programs is to retain and improve performance for new teachers in the teaching profession while improving the performance of student growth and achievement according to Ingersoll (2012).

Highly Qualified Teachers

Every year more than one hundred thousand teachers enter the teaching profession, many of whom will be unable to meet the challenges that lie ahead of them (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2007). Because NCLB (2001) requires a highly qualified teacher in every classroom, school leaders are faced with the task of meeting these federal regulations during a time when many schools are losing teachers. According to the U. S. Department of Education (2006), the primary goal of NCLB (2001) is to ensure that every child regardless of race, ethnicity, academic background, socioeconomic status, primary language spoken at home, or disability is taught by teachers who are certified and competent in the subject areas for which they teach.

NCLB (2001) requires all teachers in Title I schools to be highly-qualified; if teachers are not highly qualified and teach children for more than four weeks, schools

must inform parents of their status (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 2006). For new teachers to be considered highly qualified, they must possess the following: a bachelor's degree, hold certification in their teaching assignment as documented by their respective state agencies, and demonstrate competence in the subject area for which they teach (U. S. Department of Education, 2006). These mandates also apply to veteran teachers who may lack certification in their field of teaching but had been allowed to teach in their subject area prior to stringent regulations employed by NCLB (2001). For those teachers who do not possess proper qualifications, they can secure highly-qualified certification by attending training sessions in a particular subject area through their state agency to become highly-qualified (Mississippi Department of Education, 2012).

As an implication of NCLB, schools must inform parents if any of their staff members do not meet the definition of highly-qualified. In one particular case in Arizona schools, parents received letters stating that some teachers did not meet *highly-qualified* expectations (Kopkowski, 2008). According to John Wright, Arizona Education Association President, this was an attack on teachers. Wright claimed that teachers were expected to “meet unrealistic testing expectations” (p. 4), contributing to the demoralization of teachers and lack of respect by the community (Kopkowski, 2008).

The requirements placed on schools by NCLB (2001) made administrators and school leaders become more cognizant in their hiring practices in order to ensure compliance with NCLB mandates and required them to “focus on teacher recruitment and retention” (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 2006, p. 2). To focus on recruiting and retaining teachers, Darling-Hammond and Berry (2006) said that some districts offer incentives such as master's programs, housing, and free tuition in an effort to attract highly-

qualified teachers or prospective teachers willing to become highly qualified. Schools in high-poverty areas, however, may find it difficult to meet the challenges posed by NCLB due to teachers' unwillingness to work or remain in areas with poor working and living conditions (Ingersoll, 2004).

Because teachers generally do not want to transfer to rural or high-poverty urban school districts due to poor working conditions and lower salaries, Darling-Hammond and Berry (2006) claimed these schools and the students they serve often lack qualified teachers who could make a difference in student achievement. The Center for Teaching Quality (2006) proclaimed that teachers must have better working conditions and better compensation in order to succeed. Furthermore, The Center for Teaching Quality stated the important factors such as school leadership, the empowerment of teachers, meaningful planning time, and professional development increase the retention of teachers and student achievement.

Most people do not comprehend the importance of having quality teachers in schools, and they do not realize the complexity of teaching and the rigor that is involved in planning and making daily decisions that affect children in the classroom (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2007). Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden (2007) further emphasized that effective teachers participate in rigorous training to enhance their teaching methods, organize instruction based on students' background knowledge, demonstrate deep content knowledge in their subject area, and immerse students in rich and meaningful lessons that engage them in study. Barrett (2009) believed that teachers' "internal frustration at the necessity of meeting external demands is also evident in terms

of strong curricular framing and the pressures of timing and pacing” (p. 24) thus, posing a threat to the teaching profession.

Unlike other professions such as those in the medical field, teaching does not have the necessary government support to intervene and place teachers in the areas of greatest need; therefore, “without well-qualified teachers for schools with the neediest students” (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003, p.3), it will be difficult for schools to meet the demands of NCLB in the areas of reading and mathematics, a reality that is happening in many schools today. In their opinion of highly qualified, Miller and Davison (2006) believed that although a teacher holds certification in a particular subject area, this does not necessarily suggest that a teacher meets the criteria for being an excellent instructor or that a teacher will possess the ability to increase scores on standardized tests. Farber (2010) held the belief that too many times policy makers and school leaders made decisions to improve education without considering the effects it may have had on teachers, and many times, these decisions were made by people who have never taught.

High-Stakes Testing

During the past century, standardized testing has become the norm in educational institutions as well as the workforce and has been the driving force for the delivery of better instruction in classrooms (American College Testing [ACT], 2013; Longo, 2010). To assist students in making better decisions for their future, University of Iowa education professor E.F. Lindquist “launched the forerunner to today’s ACT test” (ACT, 2013, para. 1) in 1959 thus aiding institutions to develop student success. When examining the history of tests, Longo noted that “standardized testing has been in existence since the 1800s, but the impact of accountability was not recognized until the

late 1970s” (2010, p. 54). Upon the implementation of standardized testing came a new type of assessment called achievement tests; they were used for tracking student progress in the 1920s (Longo, 2010).

Within the past twenty years, there has been a shift in tracking educational progress. Student expenses, salaries of teachers, class size, required courses in school, and seat time once indicated school accountability or tracking of educational efforts; however, schools now face responsibility for student educational achievement through the assessment and outcome of state-measured exams (Supovitz, 2010). Although thoughts of accountability were on the horizon for many years, Longo (2010) stated that standardized testing had little influence on instructional practices until the late 1970s, a time when accountability came to fruition.

To assist in providing a quality education for all students and because of pressing concerns related to the expected increased levels of education among citizens, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed in 1965 as an effort to assist school aged children living in poverty (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Washington, 2013). This act emphasized high standards and the equalization of education for all children. With this act, states were federally funded in order to provide better education programs for children. Because many minority students from low income families were not prepared to join the workforce upon exiting high school due to the fact that they received an inadequate education and lacked literacy, these U.S. citizens found it difficult to find work (Darling-Hammond, 2007). In order to provide everyone with a better quality of life in the U.S., “a high level of shared education is essential to a free, democratic society and to the fostering of a common

culture, especially in a country that prides itself on pluralism and individual freedom” (U.S. Department of Education, 1983, p. 9).

According to Natriello and Pallas (1999), many states began implementing tests in the early seventies as the movement of minimal competency testing began to grow within the confines of education. Minimal competency testing provided feedback for teachers that showed student achievement and growth, thereby, allowing educators to form baseline data to track to student progress. Currently, most public schools and universities along with branches of the military and the general workforce expect people to take tests which assess a person’s knowledge in a particular field (Natriello & Pallas, 1999). In her book that addresses standardized testing, Dolezalek (2008) discussed reform in our nation’s schools.

In 1983, when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States, the U. S. Department of Education drafted *A Nation at Risk*. This report stated that test scores of students in K-12 public schools plunged in the 1960s and 1970s. Because of the decline in scores, lawmakers wanted to see improvement in the educational system (Dolezalek, 2008). *A Nation at Risk* emphasized the goal of student outcomes for all students and laid the foundation for what would later become known as the standards-based reform movement in education.

For many years, Americans and policy makers have been concerned with the state of education in this country (Dolezalek, 2008). *A Nation at Risk* (1983) along with much public discussion on the welfare of education in the U.S. strengthened efforts in improving education in our nation’s public schools (U.S. Department of Education, 1983). Our country which was once a leader in education, business, technology,

commerce, and science became challenged by competitors around the world, and Americans began facing mediocrity in schools (U.S. Department of Education, 1983). This report shared the national concern for high school and college students in their preparation of entering the workforce compared to nations with advanced educational systems. *A Nation at Risk*, which resulted in eighteen months of study, generated reform in U.S. schools and renewed the nation's commitment to education which has included more accountability in schools (U. S. Department of Education, 1983). The roots of NCLB may be traced back to the 1983 release of *A Nation at Risk* when our nation wanted to see improvements in the standards of America's classrooms (Barrett, 2009).

During the early 1990s, ESEA was reauthorized because lawmakers wanted educators to be held accountable for their teaching and wanted to see improvement of instruction in our nation's schools (Dolezalek, 2008). Because standardized tests demonstrated what students learned, policy makers added more accountability to the new act, No Child Left Behind. In 2001, Congress passed NCLB. In January of 2002, George W. Bush signed it into law; this law reauthorized the ESEA (Dolezalek, 2008). With assessment and accountability in place, educational leaders would be able to identify strengths and weaknesses in schools and reward those schools who demonstrate success in student achievement. The goal of NCLB (2001) is to have every child score proficient, working on grade level, in reading and math by the year 2014 (Rubin, 2011). Since the implementation of NCLB (2001), teaching in the U.S. has become progressively risky and stressful to those who remain in the profession with a particular threat posed to English and reading teachers due to the nature of accountability on state assessments (Rubin, 2011). Most accountability in schools today is placed solely on

teachers with student factors such as poverty or poor living conditions not considered, thereby, leaving teachers feeling frustrated and blamed (Hahs-Vaughan & Scherff, 2008).

Beutel and Goldstein (2009) claimed that teachers have been scrutinized and blamed for the failure of public education since *A Nation at Risk* was published in the early 1980s. This scrutiny and the effects of NCLB make teachers feel less capable of making pertinent curriculum decisions and demonstrating pedagogy in classrooms because of the narrowing of curriculum and the pressure of teaching to the test (Barrett, 2009). Moreover, teachers may also worry about the pressures of delivering instruction that yields satisfactory student growth and achievement. Many teachers feel compelled to teach directly to the test rather than cover objectives that may or may not be found on a state test; Darling-Hammond (2007) declared that which further constrains teachers to focus on teaching test-taking skills rather than content knowledge. Additionally, Darling-Hammond said that in order to prepare students with the format and test language for upcoming state tests, teachers are becoming more adept at formatting test questions on weekly assessments to mimic the layout of state tests while neglecting to teach the importance of content-specific objectives. Farber (2010) asserted that teachers in core subjects face the daunting reality of teaching verbatim from a script rather than fostering creative thinking and innovative strategies in daily lessons, thus having a negative effect on teachers and their desire to motivate students.

Consequently, NCLB (2001) mandates states to conduct standardized tests in grades 3-8 in the areas of mathematics, language arts, and most recently, the addition of science. In Mississippi high schools, students who plan to graduate with a diploma are expected to take and pass exit exams in the areas of Algebra I, Biology I, United States

History, and English II (Barrett, 2009; Mississippi Department of Education, 2011).

Each state conducts its own version of standardized testing that meets the requirements of federal regulations (Barrett, 2009). If schools do not take heed and promote student growth on these tests, they will face serious repercussions such as school takeover by state agencies for failing to meet expectations placed on them by NCLB (David, 2011; Mississippi Department of Education, 2011). The following guidelines are in place due to NCLB (2001) according to Barrett (2009):

Data on the results of these tests, for each school (and for subgroups of students delineated by their gender, race/ethnicity, family income, disability status and English language proficiency) must be reported by states and local districts. States must determine and set measures of adequate yearly progress (AYP), designed to meet the law's requirement that every student in every subgroup reach "proficiency" in each subject by 2014, and schools are subject to sanctions if any one subgroup of its students fails to meet these targets. (p. 3)

Education reform such as the implementation of standardized testing, attempts to reduce the achievement gap among students; however, educators are confronted with the problem of how to teach children creatively yet still prepare them for high stakes exams (Longo, 2010). Longo (2010) asserted that even the most skilled classroom teachers can be led in the wrong direction while trying to instruct children on the path of standardized testing. Because teachers in all subject areas to some extent share the responsibility of standardized testing for growth and student achievement in their schools, Rubin (2011) suggested that NCLB (2001) is harming both state-tested and non-state-tested teachers and their long-time commitment to the teaching profession. Moreover, Burns (2007) and

Hahs-Vaughn and Scherff (2008) indicated that English/Language Arts teachers are most affected by NCLB (2001) due to the narrowing of curriculum, prescriptive lesson plans, and repeated efforts in practicing for state assessments.

Research has shown that high-stakes testing results in teacher turnover; this is due to demands posed by administrators and lawmakers (Valli & Buese, 2007). Schools that do not show growth in terms of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) are considered to be a failure in the eyes of federal and state agencies as well as the community, consequently, resulting in the attrition of teachers (Rubin, 2011). Educators who may remain in teaching and who may feel accomplished in delivering instruction will have to contend with a new reform, Common Core State Standards.

Common Core State Standards (CCSS) are sweeping the nation, and schools across the U.S. are fretting over this new initiative (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). The Mississippi Department of Education (2013) has claimed that in English Language Arts classrooms, students will have to be proficient in reading, writing, speaking, and listening strands with the incorporation of technology, and for math, students will have to master content while demonstrating skills procedurally and conceptually. In an effort to ease teachers and children into the new form of assessments, schools began piloting the standards in classrooms, so they could be prepared for the official launch of CCSS beginning August 2014 (Mississippi Department of Education, 2013). These standards, as they promote college and career readiness, are rigorous in nature and designed to prepare students for their future (Achieve & U.S. Education Delivery Institute, 2013). District and state leaders will have to collaborate with one another to effectively prepare and evaluate teachers, and the integration of these policies at the state level of integrating

CCSS in classrooms is going to be serious for everyone involved (Achieve & U.S. Education Delivery Institute, 2013). This means that schools will have to conduct effective professional development opportunities for teachers, redesign lessons, data, and assessments for students, and implement accountability among teachers in order to ensure the effectiveness and expectations of CCSS are being carried out in classrooms (Achieve & U.S. Education Delivery Institute, 2013).

State-measured and Non-state-measured Subject Area Teacher Roles

In the wake of NCLB and *A Nation at Risk*'s efforts to produce valid measures of academic performance by students, educational reform changed the manner in which teachers plan instruction, teach in the classroom, and assess students (Supovitz, 2010). With a greater emphasis placed on high student achievement and school effectiveness, schools and teachers across the nation are working harder in an effort to report better scores on standardized tests (Lee, 2011; Pedulla et al., 2003). The role of being a state-measured subject area teacher puts additional stress on teachers in tested areas asserted Pedulla et al. (2003), while less emphasis is placed on teachers of non-state-measured subject areas. Therefore, the attempt to improve student achievement results in schools using prescriptive reading plans, and according to Dresser (2012), these plans have negative consequences on teachers and students in this nation. Dresser believed these adaptations in education change the role of teachers in the classroom. By conducting a study with elementary teachers, Dresser found that scripted lesson plans left teachers feeling "powerless and overwhelmed" (p. 71), and students did not learn important skills such as comprehension and content knowledge. Instead, they learned how to decode. With the emphasis of test accountability placed in reading, English, and math, David

(2011) wondered if subjects such as science, social studies, physical education, and the arts are disappearing from elementary schools (Supovitz, 2010).

One of the primary ambitions of NCLB (2001) was to motivate teachers and students to strive for better instruction and higher performance levels. With this educational reform come serious effects to teachers, students, and those who must abide by the regulations associated with the restructuring of educational policies (Smith & Kovacs, 2011). According to the Pedulla et al. (2003), state-measured subject area teachers such as those who teach reading, English, and math are held accountable for standardized test results due to regulations imposed by NCLB (2001). Therefore, because of testing anxiety and higher accountability placed on them, state-measured subject area teachers may exit the profession at a faster rate than those who teach non-state-measured subject areas (Rubin, 2011).

In their research, Hancock and Scherff (2010) stated that teachers of various disciplines have challenges that are different in nature, with English/language teachers facing more adversity than those teachers in other subject areas such as art, music, or science because language teachers are primarily responsible for state test results and student growth. After considering factors that lead to teachers leaving the profession, the purpose of Hancock and Scherff's (2010) study was to "identify variables representing teacher characteristics, teaching conditions, self-efficacy, perceived support, and salary that most influence English teachers' risk for attrition" (p. 329). In an effort to voice their concerns, educators are protesting across the nation to take action against high-stakes tests. Many teachers believe that standardized testing leads them to neglect

students who need additional help with content specific material and instead, focus on a narrow curriculum that leads to teaching directly to the test (Schaeffer, 2012).

Past research indicates problems in implementing reforms such as standardized testing because many educators oppose it due to the impending challenges of accountability and lack of content-rich objectives (Schaeffer, 2012; Smith & Kovacs, 2011). Because of the underlying pressure that is placed on English/language arts teachers to promote student growth, research indicates there is a need to focus on the retention of these teachers (Hahs-Vaughn and Scherff, 2008). Kopkowski (2008) reported that teachers in state-tested subject areas often feel scrutinized when the results of their labors do not reflect high scores on standardized tests. Consequently, the surmounting stress of educational reforms results in teachers feeling responsible for low student achievement contributing to teacher attrition (Smith & Kovacs, 2011). With regard to teacher accountability, there will always be students who underperform on standardized tests compared to their peers without factors such as learning disabilities, poor living conditions, or lack of parental accountability being considered for student failure; lack of student achievement is unfortunate for teachers because it makes them feel as though they have failed in the eyes of the public for not showing progress on standardized tests (Kopkowski, 2008).

Because high-stakes testing is the priority in most schools today, some teachers wait until the end of the year to teach topics that do not pertain to testing; this is done to insure all objectives related to state tests have been taught extensively (David, 2011). Because science and social studies objectives are less of a priority in schools today, David (2011) stated that many teachers integrate these subjects into their math and

language arts lessons in order to compensate for the loss of its content due to the emphasis placed on math and language arts objectives. In a report on curriculum and instruction, McMurrer (2007) found that within the past five years, there was an increase in time spent on language arts and math instruction in elementary schools within a sample of districts in the United States. Specifically, there was a 47% increase in language arts instruction and a 37% increase in math instruction (McMurrer, 2007). When schools see an increase in time spent on the state-measured subject areas, teachers are apt to let the test objectives drive instruction, thus narrowing the curriculum (David, 2011).

According to Sass, Flores, Claeys, and Perez (2012), the decision to remain or even enter the teaching profession is influenced by the demands of high-stakes testing and accountability. Grier and Holcombe (2008) found that math and English teachers in North Carolina want incentives such as additional compensation for good test results, especially for those who teach in challenging schools where respectable results may be more difficult to produce. The stress to respond to testing demands requires teachers to educate children in a fashion that may not necessarily be the best but prepares students for the test (Pedulla et al., 2003). Moon, Brighton, Jarvis, and Hall (2007) found that their purpose was to elaborate upon key findings that were identified in previous studies, which relate to the impact of state testing on students and teachers. Moon et al. (2007), on the impact of state standardized testing programs, made several conclusions. These conclusions affect both teachers and students in the testing environment and include the following:

1. Both students and teachers feel increased pressures to yield high-test scores to satisfy the requirements of NCLB.
2. Teachers feel mounting pressures to narrow their curriculum in order to drive instruction that produces admirable test results.
3. Teachers increasingly promote test taking skills in preparation of tests.
4. Teachers, especially those in state-tested areas, feel pressure from school-level and district-level administration to produce significant results on state tests.
5. Narrowing of the curriculum in order to bolster state-item testing objectives has become the priority for most schools, and teachers have no opinion in curriculum choices.
6. In schools where students are disadvantaged, teachers feel the need to promote more skill-based instruction to achieve desired results on state tests.
7. Teachers in all schools feel pressure to increase scores.
8. Above average students feel increased pressure to perform well for the sake of the entire school, which can sometimes lead to lack of interest in the learning process.
9. Gifted students feel disadvantaged and not challenged in high-stakes testing environment due to the repetitive process of learning and skill-based objectives.
10. Gifted students are adversely affected by the slow paced learning in the classroom environment.

Pedulla et al. (2003) attempted to compare elementary teachers, middle school teachers, and high school teachers in an effort to see which teachers face the greatest

amount of stress in relation to standardized testing. Their findings concluded that elementary teachers faced the greatest amount of stress due to the nature and amount of tests those teachers are responsible for, whereas high school teachers were least influenced because those teachers generally teach one subject area where students are measured on the content of that one subject area. Middle school teachers were in the middle of the findings, but those teachers were found to be more stressed than high school teachers because they are responsible for giving more tests than high school teachers. The evidence is clear from the findings of their report; high-stakes testing drives instruction. For state-measured subject area teachers, the stakes are higher than for those who teach in non-state-measured subject areas (Pedulla et al., 2003). In an effort to promote equity or equal professional responsibilities among teachers, Burns (2007) supported the idea of having professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the Conference on English Education to express concerns to policy makers about the impact of educational reform and policies on teacher accountability and what this accountability is doing to the teaching profession.

Teacher Retention and Attrition

According to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF, 2007), because teacher attrition is a primary cause of the U. S. teacher shortage, communities, stakeholders, and administrators should begin recognizing teachers for their talent and effort in the classroom (Kaback, 2006). Since educational reform became more influential in the world of education, teacher expectations have been on the rise (Farber, 2010). This comes at a time when schools in the U. S. are faced with teacher shortages because many teachers feel as though they cannot keep up with the

demands of the job. With the growing needs of teachers and the ongoing drive for test results in the classroom, now is the time for school leaders to understand the causes of teacher attrition (Feng, 2005). Furthermore, it is imperative that school leaders address attrition in public schools if they want to meet the guidelines established by NCLB legislation (McKinney et al., 2007).

Researchers have studied teacher effectiveness during the past thirty years to identify what contributes to teacher efficiency and success (Johnson, 2006). Several determinants such as working in a safe building, having necessary resources and teaching tools, working with collaborative teachers, teaching cooperative students, and receiving administrative support are important factors to consider in the influence of teacher retention according to Johnson (2006). Contrary to that, increased responsibilities, low salaries, and high-stakes standardized testing are a few of the reasons why some of the most talented teachers in the U. S. are leaving the profession (Farber, 2010).

One of the essential purposes of NCLB (2001) was to reduce the achievement gap among students. Although efforts to promote better student achievement was one of the central goals for NCLB (2001), Smith and Kovacs (2011) believed that legislation may have actually broadened the gap among students due to narrowing the curriculum, hindering the delivery of instruction, and increasing the rate of attrition in the teaching profession, especially in schools where there are increased levels of students from historically underserved groups and students from high-poverty families. McKinney et al. (2007) claimed that in areas of high poverty, teacher retention becomes a problem especially for novice teachers because lack of experience and high stress levels are overwhelming and contribute to a teacher's premature departure from the profession.

Johnson (2006) believed that work environments must be conducive to teachers' needs, and schools must promote teachers' efforts if they want teachers to improve student achievement and remain in the teaching profession. Furthermore, in an effort to retain teachers, schools leaders must demonstrate appreciation among their faculty and staff members and treat them as professionals (Farber, 2010) in order to promote teacher creativity and meaningful lessons for students (Kaback, 2006).

In their study of high-poverty schools, McKinney et al. (2007) found that schools with greater needs usually have a higher turnover rate than other schools. This is partly due to the fact that teachers feel unprepared to accommodate the academic and behavioral needs of students in high-poverty areas (McKinney et al., 2007). In Ingersoll's (2004) report on teacher turnover in high-poverty schools and data from the Teacher Follow-up survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics, the following factors contributed to teacher turnover. Retirement accounted for 14% to 25%, family and personal reasons accounted for 36%-44%, school staffing issues such as lay-offs, terminations, involuntary reassignments, and school closings accounted for 40%, and nearly 40% of teachers left schools due to job dissatisfaction. Those teachers who left because of job dissatisfaction left for better opportunities according to Ingersoll.

In Ingersoll's analysis of teacher surveys, he identified several factors that schools could use in an effort to retain teachers. Among those factors, better compensation was the most often cited incentive with measures for better school discipline, smaller class sizes, parental involvement, and more authority distributed among teachers. Contrary to most research on induction and mentoring as a method for retaining teachers, Ingersoll (2004) found that only 16.1% of teachers who left rural areas of high poverty and only

8.8% of teachers who left urban areas of high poverty claimed that induction and mentoring was beneficial to teacher retention.

In Feng's (2005) study, many factors determined teacher attrition in schools. Of those factors, teacher pay and class size were important determinants of whether teachers remained in the profession; however, classroom assignment was a significant contributing factor to whether teachers remained in the classroom. In Feng's findings, evidence suggested that those teachers who are more capable of doing a better job in the classroom are also more likely to leave the profession in search of better opportunities. Because these teachers, known as movers, migrate to other schools in search of better opportunities, attrition becomes a problem (Hahs-Vaughn & Scherff, 2008).

Additionally, according to Hahs-Vaughn and Scherff (2008), leavers, those who leave the teaching profession altogether, create an additional void in the teaching profession. When teachers leave, they take with them a plethora of essential knowledge and expertise regarding the demographics and curriculum in their school which further compromises a school's chance of finding replacements to fill the void of those quality teachers (Johnson, 2006). Feng (2005) suggested that greater emphasis should be placed on training teachers; moreover, schools must make an effort in the retention of teachers in order to meet the requirements of having highly-qualified teachers in every classroom. The cost of high teacher turnover is expensive, and according to the NCTAF (2010), our nation spends at least \$7.2 billion dollars a year on teacher turnover. These figures were based on a mid-sized urban school district in the U. S. The critical shortage of quality teachers has urged researchers to study why teachers leave and to identify solutions for keeping teachers in the classroom (Watlington, Shockley, Guglielmino, & Felsher, 2010).

Feng avowed that retaining teachers is beneficial for school finance; therefore, schools may want to consider methods to retain their teachers.

Although some schools find it nearly impossible to retain teachers, the potential to retain teachers may be an attainable goal if school leaders work together to resolve the problem. For example, in Grier and Holcombe's (2008) study on a North Carolina school district, they found only seven applications were on file for teachers of secondary mathematics. Because their district did not appeal to new hires, they found it difficult to staff some of their high-needs schools with certified teachers. One particular school, a middle school, lacked certified math teachers. Four of their high-needs high schools consistently had openings throughout the year for math teachers. The problem in finding and retaining mathematics teachers in North Carolina occurred because of low pay and pressures of standardized testing noted Grier and Holcombe. The district realized that most college graduates who possessed superior mathematics skills were more inclined to join the corporate world where salaries are more competitive and greater in measure compared to those in the educational world (Grier & Holcombe, 2008).

In an effort to hire and retain teachers in this North Carolina school district, educators were asked how the district could attract and retain teachers. Comparable to past research in the area of retention, North Carolina teachers wanted stronger leadership, incentives for subject area teachers who have the arduous task of producing test results, quality professional development, instructional coaches, and reduced class sizes. Based on the feedback that teachers provided, the Mission Possible program was established in an effort to recruit and retain teachers. This program, which was implemented in nine elementary schools, four middle schools, four high schools, and three middle-college

high schools, was based on schools who shared common characteristics. These included high numbers of free and reduced lunch among students, high teacher turnover rates in schools, the label of a Title I school, and high numbers of subgroups according to NCLB.

The Mission Possible program was based on compensation incentives, performance accountability, professional development, and structural support (Grier & Holcombe, 2008). One year after announcing the Mission Possible program, 167 certified math teachers applied for jobs, a far cry from the seven math teachers on file a year earlier. The effects of the Mission Possible program yielded positive results for the North Carolina district according to Grier and Holcombe (2008). Furthermore, only ten percent of teachers left after the second year, and those who left were the result of attrition by retirement, transfers, or long-term leave. For the first time in nearly ten years, all Mission Possible schools were staffed with highly qualified teachers (Grier & Holcombe, 2008).

Policy makers have often responded to the problem of teacher attrition; however, their efforts to solve the shortage have not been effective. Ingersoll and Smith (2003) believed that teachers' working conditions and administrative support would significantly assist in solving the teacher shortage. According to McKinney, "unless more attention is given to teacher retention, and why some educators are successful and persevere in even the most hard-to-staff schools, teacher attrition will continue to be a national concern" (2007, p. 1).

Teacher Job Satisfaction

If "education is the backbone of a nation" (Fatima, 2012, p. 260) and teachers are the chief contributors to the structure of the educational system, then job satisfaction is an

important factor in the retention of teachers. Job satisfaction for teachers is important if policy makers and leaders want students to demonstrate progress in meeting the expectations of school reform (Knox & Anfara, 2013). According to a recent MetLife survey of teachers, only 39% of teachers are very satisfied with their jobs, down from 62% in 2008 (MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2013). This statistic clearly indicates that teachers are experiencing increased difficulties in their profession such as the demands to improve student outcomes on state-mandated tests, therefore, contributing to more dissatisfaction in the teaching profession (Moore, 2012).

Fatima (2012) further declared that in order for teachers to become effective in the classroom, they must first be satisfied with their job. If teachers are satisfied with their jobs, stated Fatima, the school as a whole will benefit from their effectiveness. Colleagues will gain from collaborative working experiences with satisfied teachers, and students will likely produce academic gains through the exposure of positive teachers explained Fatima in his research involving satisfaction of secondary school teachers. According to research conducted through the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013), effective teachers account for 33% of student achievement gains. Therefore, it is conceivable for leaders and policy makers to address key factors that may contribute to teacher satisfaction in an effort to retain teachers in U. S. schools.

In Knox and Anfara's (2013) research on understanding job satisfaction, they reported that job satisfaction is the most frequently studied variable in organizational behavior. The primary reason for it being examined and studied so closely is that behavior among employees is a contributing factor to whether a business or organization is successful or not. Without satisfied employees, businesses and organizations cannot

produce necessary gains, and in the world of education, it is crucial that teachers and leaders produce those gains in order to satisfy requirements of NCLB (2001).

To obtain a better understanding of teachers' views of the teaching profession, 1,000 K-12 U. S. educators participated in a survey (MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2013). Feedback from educators provided researchers with essential information regarding challenges in schools, roles of principals and teachers, financial information, and job satisfaction. In assessing teacher satisfaction, the survey found that teacher satisfaction has been reduced by 23 percentage points with a decrease of five-points within the last year alone. According to the MetLife survey, in the past twenty-five years, this is the lowest level of teacher satisfaction documented to date. Teachers reported that they feel constant scrutiny and stress several days a week. This is a substantial increase in the amount of stress that teachers feel compared to those teachers surveyed in 1985 by MetLife.

Because today's teachers are faced with more demands, schools consistently face the issue of teacher burnout and teacher retention. In her quest to examine burnout levels in educators, Pucella (2011) sought one particular group of teachers to study, those who attained National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). This study investigated whether these prestigious teachers demonstrated the same level of teacher satisfaction compared to their peers. Pucella's (2011) study found that teachers often cited the following reasons for leaving the profession: lack of consensus decision making among teachers, lack of career advancement, lack of pay, lack of respect for the teaching profession, lack of administrative support, student and parental issues, and violence in

schools. Additionally, she found that teachers in middle and high schools were more likely to experience burnout than those in elementary schools.

One of the primary purposes in conducting this study was to determine if the rigorous standards posed by the National Board Certification process would enhance teacher confidence and decrease levels of burnout (Pucella, 2011). Teachers who complete the process of National Board Certification must be familiar with the standards and build upon their teaching pedagogy in an effort to establish professionalism in the classroom and become leaders in their schools. Standards developed by NBPTS focus on content knowledge, commitment to education, professional development, a deep understanding of student comprehension, and reflecting upon one's teaching. To complete the NBPTS process, teachers must submit a portfolio demonstrating the aforementioned standards, and teacher candidates must take a rigorous exam and pass it (NBPTS, 2013). According to Pucella (2011), when teachers successfully complete this rigorous process, many of them rejuvenate their confidence and commitment to the profession, thereby, possibly preventing the factors that are associated with burnout in the classroom.

Only 3% of our nation's teachers participate in this program, mainly due to lack of monetary incentives offered by some states and districts according to NBPTS (2013). For states that offer salary enticements, teachers are more apt to complete the process and potentially commit to the profession (NBPTS, 2013; Pucella, 2011). In many states and school districts, teachers receive great monetary incentives for completing the rigorous process, one more reason to achieve the National Board Certified status. Although teachers must pay an initial fee of \$2,500 to become board certified, some districts will

reimburse or even pay up front for teachers to complete the process (NBPTS, 2013). National Board Certified teachers in Mississippi receive an increase of \$6,000 per year for ten years, and then teachers must renew the certificate (NBPTS, 2013). Because of Mississippi's incentive pay for teachers completing the National Board Certification process, Mississippi currently ranks 7th in the nation for the total number of National Board Certified teachers (NPBTS, 2013). The satisfaction gained from National Board Certification and monetary incentives could be the professional momentum that many teachers need in order to replenish their love for the profession and increase levels of satisfaction among teachers.

Intrinsic Motivators for Teachers

The teaching profession, although challenging in many ways, can be fulfilling to those who seek challenges and use internal satisfaction of their jobs as personal motivators. In a study conducted by Perrachione et al. (2008), 300 Missouri public schoolteachers in grades K-5 were asked to identify intrinsic and extrinsic variables that influence teacher job satisfaction and retention. Of the 300 teachers surveyed, 201 responded with intrinsic motivation as being a contributing factor in teacher job satisfaction. The significant factors in intrinsic motivation included working with students, job satisfaction, and personal teaching efficacy. The findings of their survey concluded that intrinsic variables contributed to teacher job satisfaction more so than extrinsic motivators such as low salary and overload (Perrachione et al., 2008).

In a national study conducted by Curtis (2012), mathematics teachers were asked the reasons they entered the teaching profession compared to the reasons they would leave the teaching profession. Of the pre-service teachers that were surveyed, 71%

reported their personal satisfaction as a reason for becoming a teacher, 70% of teachers claimed they liked the subject area, and 66% of the teachers claimed they enjoyed working with children. The findings of Curtis's survey sum up what Ryan and Deci (2000) reported about intrinsic motivation. They said that when people are intrinsically motivated, they accomplish tasks for sheer pleasure and the challenge of personal fulfillment. Furthermore, Ryan and Deci stated that these teachers are not motivated by pressure and incentives. For teachers who are motivated intrinsically, teaching is a rewarding career rather than a tedious job that requires constant stimulation which is provided by external motivators (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Summary

Academic accountability, which was generated from documents such as *A Nation at Risk* and policies such as NCLB (2001), is increasing in K-12 public schools in the United States. Because of widespread accountability in schools throughout the past three decades, school leaders now realize the importance of hiring effective teachers who are highly qualified to teach in a particular content area (Miller & Davison, 2006). Although qualifications of teachers seems crucial to fulfilling state and federal requirements in schools, Miller and Davison (2006) said that just because a teacher has content knowledge in a particular subject area does not necessarily mean that a teacher can guarantee student success. Although teachers may try to find success with every student in the classroom, end results may not always represent the laborious efforts of teachers. Lack of success coupled with lack of supportive principals may cause teachers to burnout and become dissatisfied with the profession according to Prather-Jones (2011). Many

teachers claim that administrators and their lack of support are a contributing factor to a teacher's intent to remain or leave the profession.

Every school in the U. S. should have a competent teacher in the classroom; however, teachers are not being fully trained or educated on present-day strategies in order to meet the needs of current reform (Supovitz, 2010). This lack of training may cause teachers to become frustrated in their daily efforts. When teachers face the uncertainty of their effectiveness and when they feel overwhelmed in meeting daily teaching requirements, the problem of attrition becomes problematic. Extra responsibilities placed on teachers such as individualized student instruction, collaborative planning of instruction, parent conferences, meaningless professional development, grading of papers, and teaching seven-to-eight hours a day are turning some teachers away from the profession and making it difficult to recruit new ones (Cochran-Smith et al., 2011).

Because teachers want good results from their students, most teachers strive to meet daily goals and objectives in their classroom by analyzing test data and reflecting upon it in an effort to improve classroom instruction as well as teacher effectiveness (Pedulla et al., 2003). However, when teachers become frustrated with meeting accountability expectations in addition to dealing with disruptive students, many of them tend to shut down and leave the teaching profession (Brill & McCartney, 2008; Smethem, 2007). Flynt and Morton (2009) claimed teacher turnover has an effect on student outcomes and that school leaders need to take a closer look at this problem.

The information collected in this literature review informed the researcher's study on the effects of high-stakes testing and school leadership on teachers' intent to

remain or leave the teaching profession. The researcher's intent to examine state-measured subject area teachers and non-state-measured subject area teachers and school leadership effects on the teaching profession will provide leaders and policy makers with valuable information in reducing the problem of attrition in Mississippi public schools. Data collected will assist stakeholders in finding methods, or perhaps a solution, to what is becoming a waning profession in the eyes of some educators.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of leadership and high-stakes testing with regard to teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. This chapter examined whether principal leadership styles and behaviors had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. It also examined whether state-measured subject area teachers and non-state-measured subject area teachers were more likely to remain or leave the teaching profession due to state and federal mandates for standardized testing. Data were obtained through a survey, which was designed by the researcher. The survey was distributed to 501 teachers of state-measured subject areas and teachers of non-state-measured subject areas in K-12 public schools in five school districts located in south Mississippi. Surveys were given to teachers during the spring semester of the 2013-2014 school year.

Chapter III was organized in the following manner: research design, participants in the study, positionality statement, instrumentation, procedures, data analysis, and a summary of the chapter. A copy of the survey instrument as well as other pertinent documents was included in the Appendix section. The following questions served as a guide to this research:

1. Is there a relationship between principal leadership styles and behaviors and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession?
2. Is there a difference in the levels of teacher job satisfaction between teachers of state-measured subject areas and teachers of non-state-measured subject areas?

3. Is there a relationship between teacher job satisfaction, teacher morale, and teacher mentoring programs and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession?
4. Is there a difference between self-reported factors that contribute to teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession?

Hypotheses

H1: There is a statistically significant relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher morale, teacher satisfaction, and teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession.

H2: There is a statistically significant difference between state-measured subject area teachers' and non-state-measured subject area teachers' intent to remain in the profession.

Research Design

The researcher conducted a descriptive correlational study that was quantitative in nature with a qualitative section. There were five self-reported factors included in the survey, and these questions were qualitative in nature. Information from the study was collected by using survey methodology. Demographical information was collected and analyzed in order to compare gender, age, years of teaching experience, type of school setting, teacher certifications, and teaching position. In order to analyze qualitative data, the researcher read every survey to determine which self-reported factors were used most frequently.

Participants

The researcher requested permission from eight superintendents in school districts located in south Mississippi (Appendix A). Of the eight districts, five superintendents granted permission (Appendix B) to conduct the study in their districts. Upon obtaining Institutional Review Board permission (Appendix C), the researcher contacted principals in order to seek permission to conduct the study within their schools. The researcher provided principals with a cover letter explaining the survey (Appendix D). Upon receiving permission from principals, the researcher delivered survey instruments to schools. The survey instrument was examined prior to distribution among teachers by a panel of experts. This committee was provided with a cover letter (Appendix E) stating the purpose of the survey and information on anonymity, a validity questionnaire (Appendix F), and a copy of the survey instrument (Appendix G). Experts were chosen based on their expertise in education, their honesty, and their ability to critically examine the instrument and provide feedback to the researcher. Experts assisted the researcher in determining question clarity and content validity.

Participants for this study included five public school districts in the southern region of Mississippi. Of the five school districts surveyed, only three school districts returned surveys to the researcher. Although approximately one hundred participants were needed for the power of the study, a total of 212 respondents completed surveys. The sample included both state-measured subject area teachers and non-state-measured subject area teachers from all levels including elementary, middle, and high school settings. Including a variety of school districts, teachers from various grade levels, and teachers from different subject areas supported the importance of this study because it

provided the researcher with essential information regarding teacher perceptions. The following information is included because many times salary is one of the biggest factors for teachers leaving the teaching profession. Receiving input from districts in south Mississippi with higher teacher salaries compared to other areas in Mississippi provided a more in-depth look at salaries and their importance or lack of importance to teachers' intent to remain in or leave the teaching profession. In this study, salary was not found to be a major contributing factor to teacher dissatisfaction.

The importance of receiving information from teachers in state-measured subject areas and non-state-measured subject areas provided the researcher with pertinent information with regard to whether standardized testing had an impact on teacher retention. Additional information such as grade level provided the researcher with evidence as to whether teachers in certain schools such as elementary, middle, or high schools were more dissatisfied in their profession due to the age of the students they teach. With approval from local superintendents and principals in the selected school districts in south Mississippi and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of The University of Southern Mississippi, participants in the study were given cover letters (Appendix H) that explained the study, the purpose of the study, confidentiality, and voluntary participation. The survey included a consent form where the respondent either checked *yes* to give permission to the researcher or checked *no* for permission not granted.

Participants were asked demographic information such as gender, age, number of years in teaching, type of school setting (elementary, middle, high), certification, and additional teacher characteristics. This information was gathered in order to provide the researcher with important information to add to the validity of this study. The researcher

ensured confidentiality by not requesting name, place of employment, or any other identifiable information.

Positionality Statement

As a state-measured subject area teacher who has witnessed much turnover in my junior high school within the past three years, I based my survey questions on my perceptions of teacher adversity and experiences in a school setting. Out of twenty-one years of being in the teaching profession, I spent eighteen years as an English teacher in the seventh and/or eighth grade classroom setting. In an effort to be the best at my craft, I participated in the National Board Certification process during my sixth year of teaching. This rigorous process renewed my spirit and my love for the teaching profession. As one of the first as well as the youngest in my district to achieve this prestigious certification, I became proactive in helping others to pursue National Board status.

During my eighth year of teaching, I began to feel the pressure of being a state-measured subject area teacher. At that time, the MCT test was making its way into public schools in Mississippi. Although I enjoyed teaching English and was effective in the classroom, I began to experience burnout. I considered teaching another subject; however, I did not want to take the time to get additional certifications because I had small children at home. Getting additional certifications or endorsements meant more time away from my family, and after being away from them all day, I did not want to exert the extra energy into getting certified in another discipline. Therefore, I continued in the English classroom for another six years.

By then, it was my fifteenth year in education, and I knew that I needed a change. I was overwhelmed with teaching responsibilities, and I knew that the teaching demands

were going to worsen because the MCT2 was being implemented the following year. During the summer of 2008, I decided to pursue additional endorsements from Mississippi State University in the areas of seventh grade Career Discovery and eighth grade Computer Discovery. By getting both endorsements, I knew that I would have a better chance of leaving my state-measured subject area.

During my sixteenth year, an opening in Career Discovery became available for the following school year. I persuaded my principal to let me out of the English classroom. He did not want me to leave the English classroom because I had always been effective and produced good test results. My effectiveness in the classroom was a reflection on him because if teachers had good test scores, principals received bonuses. In my opinion, I thought that I deserved a bonus for producing academic growth among my students. While my principal did not achieve results, he reaped the benefits.

After much determination on my part and discussion with my principal, I convinced my principal to let me venture into a new subject area. I reminded him that someone had given him an opportunity to pursue something new when he wanted to leave the classroom. Furthermore, I elaborated about the stress I encountered and the burnout I experienced after teaching the same thing for sixteen years. After granting me permission to leave the English classroom, I told my principal that I appreciated his professional courtesy for allowing me to leave a state-measured subject area.

The following year four months into teaching my new subject area, I was asked to tutor students in English during one period of the day. At my principal's request, I obeyed. I did not have much of a choice because I was under contract. The following year, I voluntarily moved into Computer Discovery. I taught Career Discovery and

Computer Discovery one year each when a new principal arrived and made me begin teaching one class of eighth-grade English. To say that I was upset was an understatement. My requirement that year was to teach nine students who scored basic on the MCT2. My principal and my director of secondary education informed me that it was my job to move students from basic to proficient on the MCT2 if I wanted to remain a Computer Discovery teacher. I took that as a direct threat and followed through with their request. Then, the unexpected happened.

In the middle of the school year, a sixth-grade teacher quit. Because I had an English endorsement, I was pulled out of my Computer Discovery classes and the one English class that I taught and sent to teach English to sixth-grade students at our junior high. I was told that I would do this until administrators could find a replacement English teacher. Basically, I was used as a substitute teacher for two weeks. This act, made by my administrators, crushed my spirit and almost ruined my teaching career. I had never wanted to quit as much as I wanted to quit that day. With a lot of support from friends and family, I made it through those two weeks.

My principals then sent me back to my eighth-grade Computer Discovery classroom, but my English students still remained in other teachers' classrooms. When I inquired about the nine English students they specifically gave to me at the beginning of the year, they said, "Oh yeah, we'll return them to you tomorrow." Those nine students, who needed me more than any other students, had been dispersed while I taught sixth-grade English. Because they developed a rapport with me, they had a hard time adapting in other teachers' classrooms. Meanwhile, administrators had no regard for the students' feelings or mine. After all adjustments were made, I managed to get myself back

together and do what was best for my students. By the end of the year, six of my nine students showed tremendous growth on the MCT2 and in class, but I was told that I would no longer be teaching Computer Discovery the following year. The district “decided” to remove it from the eighth grade required courses list. I felt betrayed by administrators because they told me that if my students did well, I would remain a Computer Discovery teacher. Instead, of following through with their promise, my administrators lied to me (and another Computer Discovery teacher) in order to ensure that we continued to promote student growth among our basic students.

The following year, my twentieth and last year in the classroom, my principal informed me that I would teach four seventh-grade English classes and two eighth-grade technology classes. It was then that I fully realized I would have to leave my school district of twenty years. I so badly wanted to try new areas and venture into advanced career opportunities, but because I had always produced good *test scores*, I would never be able to accomplish my professional goals in that district. I fulfilled all teaching obligations that final year in the classroom. However, as soon as I found an advanced career opportunity in another school district, I took it; meaning, I contributed to attrition in the teaching profession. I tried to remain in the classroom, but I felt as though I was forced out.

I believe that mediocrity is rewarded, and those who strive to do their best are punished by being held prisoner in state-measured classrooms. I felt punished because I was never seen as anything other than a *great* English teacher, and any state-measured teacher will attest to the fact that all pressure lies on the shoulders of state-measured teachers. These are the very teachers who receive the same salary as everyone else, yet

they have to attend more meetings, track more test data, and compete with teachers in their departments for top scores. No one wants his or her name to be on the bottom of a chart; therefore, they work extremely hard to produce student achievement results. These results, in my opinion, are making great teachers leave the classroom in pursuit of other career opportunities. I should know this because I am one who could no longer remain in the classroom due to lack of administrative support and the extreme demands placed on me. My new role in the teaching profession includes providing support for teachers by assisting them in learning about Common Core State Standards and helping all teachers to track student growth and achievement. For once in my career, I really feel appreciated, supported, and stress-free.

Instrumentation

The researcher used a quantitative survey instrument with a qualitative component. The instrument included teacher demographic selection questions, Likert-scale perception questions, and five self-reported (open-ended) questions. This survey instrument was devised by the researcher in an effort to seek honest answers and perceptions about the teaching profession from teachers with various years of teaching experience in K-12 public schools. In order to validate the questions in the Teacher Retention Survey Instrument, the researcher formed a panel of experts.

These experts consisted of the following: an active superintendent in a rural south Mississippi school district, a retired superintendent from a south Mississippi city school district, a retired personnel director from a south Mississippi city school district, an assistant principal in a city school district in south Mississippi, and a junior high school teacher in a county school district in south Mississippi. Their credentials consist of the

following. The first expert is a former secondary math teacher. He is now serving his second year in the capacity of a superintendent in a rural school district. The next expert is a retired superintendent. He retired from public education two years ago with 30 years of educational experience but continues to stay active in the educational community where he resides in south Mississippi. Expert number three is a retired personnel director who began his career in education 35 years ago. He served in the capacity of teacher, principal, and personnel director. The next expert is an assistant principal who began his career as a high school math teacher. He is currently pursuing his doctorate degree in administration in hopes of attaining the position of superintendent of schools in his future. The last expert is a teacher in a county school which is deemed a Title I school. He is certified to teach middle school math, elementary education (4-8), and social studies (7-12). In 2011, he obtained his doctorate degree in school leadership. Currently, he is teaching a state-measured subject area in a junior high school.

The next step in this educational research was to conduct a pilot study which consisted of twelve educators from various IRB approved school districts. Results from the pilot study were placed in SPSS, and a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient test was used to examine the internal consistency reliability of the survey instrument. The researcher wanted a minimum score of .70 on all questions in order to use these questions on the final survey instrument. As noted in Table 1, reliabilities of at least .689 were recorded for all sections of the pilot study except teacher intention and intrinsic motivators. The teacher intention scale and intrinsic motivators scale did not work; however, both sections remained on the survey. Since the teacher intention section did

not work as a scale, only question 16 was used to measure intention. Specifically, this question asked teachers if they planned to remain in the teaching profession next year.

In the final study, reliabilities for the subscales were similar to the pilot study. Reliabilities for teacher intention and intrinsic motivators continued to be extremely low and did not behave as a scale. In examining reliabilities for these two sections, the researched noted that the scores continued to be low, lower than the cut-off value of .70. Because this study was based on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession, Question 16 was the only question used in the teacher intention section of the final study. Reliabilities for both the pilot study and the final study scores can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1

Cronbach's alpha (Pilot Study and Final Study)

Survey Section	Pilot Study Scores	Final Study Scores
Principal Behaviors	.736	.877
Teacher Job Satisfaction	.919	.799
Teacher Mentoring	.689	.651
Teacher Intent	.664	.455
Intrinsic Motivators	.675	.461

All qualitative questions in the pilot study were answered by respondents, resulting in 100% participation. Upon completion of the pilot study, survey questions, both quantitative and qualitative in nature, were examined and adjusted to validate questions for the research study. Based upon feedback from the pilot study, the researcher also created a Frequently Asked Question sheet (Appendix I) to send to principals. This was created in order to provide further clarification should any teachers have questions about the survey.

The Teacher Retention Survey Instrument was divided into seven sections. The first section was entitled Teacher Characteristics. This section consisted of demographic questions regarding age, gender, years in the teaching profession, school setting, education, certifications, teaching position, and a question concerning choice of profession. The second section, which encompassed five areas, dealt with Working Environment Factors that included the following sections: principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, and intrinsic motivators. These sections of the survey instrument used five-point Likert-scale questions to discuss the reactions of teachers. Participants chose from a range of categories (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. The following questions were reversed in an effort to ensure that participants carefully read and correctly answered survey questions: 15, 21, 24, 25, 27, 32, 35, and 40.

The principal leadership behaviors' section assisted in answering questions about the perceptions of teachers and how they felt about administration at their school. This section determined whether or not teachers felt supported by their administration and whether or not administrative support contributed to teacher attrition. Additionally, this section of the instrument corresponded to the first research question with regard to the relationship between principal leadership styles and behaviors and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession.

The third section focused on teacher intention. This section provided the researcher with pertinent information regarding whether teachers planned on remaining in the profession or leaving the profession. Additional information provided the researcher with information such as teachers remaining in the profession but moving into

administration. This information provided the researcher with evidence as to whether a teacher may be moving for the purpose of a higher salary or to get out of the classroom due to frustrations of teaching. Answers from this section were used to draw conclusions to support or reject hypotheses one and two in later chapters.

Section four of the survey instrument examined teacher job satisfaction. This area of the survey encompassed teacher perceptions and feelings about parents, students, fellow colleagues, and administrators. Further questions included job recognition, salary, burnout, subject-area contentment, hours in a work-week, high-stakes testing, decision making, freedom of expression, and morale among teachers. These questions assisted the researcher in explaining teacher frustrations and what lent itself to dissatisfaction in the teaching profession.

The fifth section was entitled Teacher Mentoring. This section examined whether novice teachers or teachers in general felt supported in their daily efforts. Mentoring or lack thereof could affect teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession; therefore, this information was important especially for those new to the profession or new to a school. Research shows that novice teachers generally leave within the first five years due to lack of support by colleagues and administrators; therefore, schools must provide support to new teachers in order to encourage their teaching skills and success as teachers (Ingersoll, 2012).

Section six explored potential motivators for teachers. This section was entitled Intrinsic Motivators and was the final section of the five-point Likert scale format. Information gained from this section provided the researcher with pertinent information

regarding motivational factors for teachers. Motivators included salary, the rewards of teaching children, performance challenges, and rewards by administrators.

The last section, entitled Self-Reported Factors, included five open-ended questions developed by the researcher in an effort to gain critical information for teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Questions included which factors contributed to teachers' decisions to remain or leave the teaching profession, whether teachers had ever left the teaching profession, reasons for becoming a teacher, and the three contributing factors that bothered teachers most about the teaching profession. From this qualitative section, the researcher compiled data and noted the most commonly discussed themes as the chief factors that contributed to teacher job satisfaction or lack thereof. This section was applied to research question four and assisted the researcher in determining how teachers feel about the teaching profession.

Procedures

The researcher employed the following process for distributing survey instruments to participants and retrieving them in order to gather data. After obtaining approval from five superintendents in south Mississippi and the Institutional Review Board at The University of Southern Mississippi as previously mentioned, the researcher sent cover letters to principals in five school districts in south Mississippi seeking permission to conduct the study. Principals also received a copy of the Frequently Asked Question sheet. The cover letter, which accompanied the survey, explained the anonymity of completing the survey, confidentiality of the survey, and voluntary participation of the survey. Anonymity was preserved as there were no identifiable marks on questions, and all surveys were printed on white paper.

Upon receiving permission to conduct the study in a school district, the researcher asked principals to provide faculty members with a copy of the survey. The principal administered the questionnaire during a faculty meeting, department meeting, or a time that each faculty deemed appropriate. Upon completion of the surveys, the principal collected the surveys and put them in a manila envelope. The researcher was contacted via email or a phone call from each school principal or designee to confirm completion of surveys. The researcher collected surveys from each school in a sealed envelope in order to compile data for the study. School districts were given the opportunity to request a summary of the data upon completion of the dissertation process.

Data Analysis

Upon gathering all information from participants, the researcher entered the raw data from 212 participants into SPSS version 20. Data were analyzed using frequency, means, standard deviations, a Pearson Correlation, multiple regression, and t-tests. The researcher used descriptive statistics, demographic information such as age, gender, race, years of teaching experience, and types of certification. In order to reject or support the hypotheses, the researcher tested the Likert response questions to determine the significance of the data, which will be based on the alpha level of .05. Qualitative data obtained from open-ended questions were transcribed and theoretically coded and tabulated to determine the frequency of answers and which factors contributed greatest to teacher satisfaction or lack thereof. In order to determine qualitative data, the researcher read through each set of questions and marked the responses. The researcher then tallied the answers to determine which factors were mentioned most frequently.

Summary

Because of reform efforts, schools across each state and within the nation are competing for top scores on high-stakes assessments (Longo, 2010). Student outcomes have become a top priority in education, and teachers are working to achieve academic growth and student progress within their respective schools on state assessments. Ultimately, the impact of these tests has resulted in narrowing of the school curriculum, lack of creativity in the classroom, and scripted lesson plans (Dresser, 2012; Longo, 2010). Subject-area content is no longer a priority in most schools due to the major focus on state-tested content, and many principals are encouraging teachers to teach to the test (David, 2011; Farber, 2010; Pedulla et al., 2003). For some teachers who teach state-measured subject areas, the pressure has become too much, and teachers leave the profession (Schneider, 2012). Many teachers in state-measured subject areas feel as though they bear the weight of the school in terms of school accountability (Kohn, 2000).

Because principals are primarily held accountable for academic results by their superintendents, they may shift additional stress onto teachers, yet they may not provide encouragement and support along the way. This study explored ways that teachers in Mississippi wanted principals, district leaders, and policy makers to assist them in building their capacity of becoming better educators and becoming more satisfied in their profession. This can be accomplished by listening to the needs of teachers and supporting them in their efforts of teaching children in Mississippi public schools. Data collected from this study could provide stakeholders in south Mississippi with an opportunity to get involved in improving teacher job satisfaction and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine whether principal leadership behaviors and the demands of high-stakes tests had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Perceptions of teachers concerning the contributing factors that led to their intent to remain in the teaching profession were also examined. Surveys were given to five school districts in south Mississippi. Within those districts, they were given to four high schools, three elementary schools, and two middle schools. Three high schools returned surveys, two elementary schools returned surveys, and two middle schools returned surveys. Specifically, 59 elementary teachers, 39 middle school teachers, and 114 high school teachers responded from three of the five school districts. Permission was granted by superintendents and principals from all five districts. There were 501 surveys given out, and 212 of them were completed and returned. The return rate was 42%.

These public school teachers were given surveys to examine the relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher morale, teacher satisfaction, and teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession and also whether state-measured subject area teachers or non-state-measured subject area teachers were more likely to remain in the profession. Each survey contained five open-ended questions which asked if teachers had ever left the profession and if so, which factors contributed greatest to teachers remaining or leaving the teaching profession, why teachers became teachers, and what three things bothered them most about the teaching profession. These open-ended

questions made the study more robust as the participants were able to provide in their own words what three things bothered them most about the teaching profession.

This chapter includes descriptive statistics of the respondents surveyed and a descriptive breakdown of responses to open-ended questions. Several tests were used to examine quantitative data based on the Likert-scale questions and responses. Descriptive statistics, a Pearson Correlation, an independent *t*-test, and simple regression were conducted to examine if there was a statistically significant difference between principal leaderships styles and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession, state-measured subject area teacher job satisfaction compared to non-state-measured subject area teacher job satisfaction, teacher satisfaction and teacher mentoring, and the intent to remain in the teaching profession.

Descriptive frequencies were examined for gender, age, years of teaching experience, school setting, certification, if teachers would choose this profession again, and whether teachers were state-measured or non-state-measured subject area teachers. The Pearson Correlation was conducted to see if there was a relationship between principal leadership styles and behaviors and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. An independent *t*-test was conducted to compare the means and to determine the difference in levels of teacher job satisfaction between teachers of state-measured and non-state-measured subject areas. Simple regression was run to determine if there was a relationship between teacher job satisfaction and teacher mentoring programs and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession.

Qualitative data were examined to determine if there was a difference between self-reported factors that contributed to teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching

profession. The constant-comparative method was used for analyzing qualitative data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This method was used by the researcher to develop concepts from the data by reading each survey and documenting frequent themes among open-ended questions. The researcher coded responses using three levels of analyses: open coding through the use of comparing data, axial coding through the use of connections between categories, and selective coding through the use of identification of core categories that developed. Themes emerged as the researcher coded each question by tallying participant responses by hand and then placing them in Microsoft Word tables to analyze the collected data. Through constant comparisons of data, theories emerged, and the researcher was able to determine which factors contributed most to teacher job satisfaction and teacher job dissatisfaction.

Results

This quantitative study with a qualitative component was used to provide the researcher with teachers' intent to remain in or leave the teaching profession based on principal leadership styles and behaviors, state-measured and non-state-measured subject area teachers' job satisfaction, and other contributing factors such as mentoring and intrinsic motivators and their effect on teacher job satisfaction and intent to remain in the teaching profession. The survey instrument was divided into seven sections. Section I produced quantitative data based on demographics, teaching experience, education, certifications, and teacher perceptions. Sections II through VI explored principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, and intrinsic motivators. These questions and their responses were based on a Likert-scale where (1) indicated Strongly Disagree and (5) indicated Strongly Agree. Respondents

were asked to base their answers on their current teaching assignment and on their current principal(s). Section VII contained five open-ended questions with regard to self-reported factors pertaining to the teaching profession. This section of the survey instrument yielded qualitative data.

A Pearson Correlation was used to respond to Research Question 1 based on a p -value of .05. A t-test was used to respond to Research Question 2 where means were compared and a p -value of .05 was used to indicate the significance level. Simple Regression was used to respond to Research Question 3 based on a p -value of .05.

Descriptive Statistics

Two hundred and twelve K-12 public school teachers in south Mississippi participated in this study. Demographic data are presented in Table 2. The data collected for this section of the survey, specifically question number 9, was used in response to Research Question 2. Table 2 displays a gender distribution of 22.6% male ($n=48$) and 77.4% female ($n=164$). The data clearly indicated more females completed surveys. The ages among the surveyed teachers were quite similar in three of the categories, with the most being in category 2, ages 30-39. Category 2 had 34% ($n=34$). The category with the least was Category 1, which consisted of 15.6% ($n=33$). Those teachers range in age from 20-29. Because this age represents the least, it could indicate that people at this age are pursuing other career fields.

Of the 212 surveyed teachers, the largest percent of teachers had between 11-20 years of experience with 36.3% ($n=77$). Teachers with the least percent consisted of those teachers with 30+ years in the teaching profession which had 4.7% ($n=10$). This low percentage of teachers with 30+ years could be attributed to teachers retiring at

twenty-five years of service, which is the minimum amount of years required to reach retirement in Mississippi when those teachers entered the profession.

Table 2

Teacher Demographics (N=212)

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	48	22.6
Female	164	77.4
Age		
20-29	33	15.6
30-39	72	34.0
40-49	56	26.4
50+	51	24.1
Teaching Experience		
1-5	57	26.9
6-10	45	21.2
11-20	77	36.3
21-30	23	10.8
30+	10	4.7

Table 3 refers to which type of school setting teachers worked (elementary school, middle school, or high school), education, and types of certification. Because more high schools completed and returned surveys, this could indicate why high school

teachers had the most respondents with 53.8% (n=114), whereas middle school teachers had the least with 18.4% (n=39). In looking at education levels of teachers surveyed, most teachers reported having a bachelor's degree 50.5% (n=107) almost comparable to the amount of teachers who reported having a master's degree 46.7% (n=99). Having a doctoral degree was the lowest with only .9% (n=2), which could be contributed to the fact that many teachers with doctoral degrees leave the classroom in pursuit of advanced career opportunities. One teacher did not answer her level of education.

In examining whether teachers were highly qualified or not highly qualified to teach the subject they were currently teaching, 93.4% (n=198) reported that they were highly qualified while 6.6% (n=14) reported that they were not highly qualified to teach the subject for which they were currently teaching. The large number of highly qualified teachers could be attributed to state and federal mandates which require teachers to be highly qualified. The last question in Table 3 asked respondents if they were a National Board Certified teacher. Of the 212 respondents surveyed, the majority of teachers reported that they were not National Board Certified 94.3% (n=200), while a small percentage of teachers reported being National Board Certified 5.7% (n=12). This low percentage of teachers with National Board status could indicate that fewer teachers are pursuing National Board Certification due to excessive demands placed on them. Please see Table 3 on the following page.

Table 3

Teacher Demographics (N=212)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
School Setting		
Elementary School	59	27.8
Middle School	39	18.4
High School	114	53.8
Education Level		
Bachelor's Degree	107	50.5
Master's Degree	99	46.7
Specialist's Degree	3	1.4
Doctoral Degree	2	.9
Highly Qualified		
Yes	198	93.4
No	14	6.6
National Board Certified		
Yes	12	5.7
No	200	94.3

The last two survey questions concerning demographics were based on whether teachers would choose to become a teacher or choose a different profession if they had the opportunity to go back to college. The final question in the demographic section asked teachers to state their current teaching position. Of the teachers surveyed, 60.8%

(n=129) said they would choose to become a teacher if given the opportunity again, while 36.8% (n=78) said they would choose a different profession. Five teachers did not answer this question.

In asking what teachers' current teaching position was, most teachers reported being a state-tested subject area teacher 37.3% (n=79), while special education teachers reported the least amount at 10.4% (n=22). One teacher did not answer this question. Although there appeared to be more state-tested teachers, the researcher noted that when the other three categories were combined, those categories actually represented the largest percentage. Answer choices 2; non-state-tested subject area teacher, 3; special education teacher, and 4; elective teacher are all considered to be non-state-tested subject area teachers, 62.3% (n=132).

The researcher informed all principals to explain to participants that if special education teachers were held responsible for sub-group scores at their individual schools, then those teachers were to mark state-tested subject area teacher on the survey. This was done in an effort to have accurate data representing teachers who were responsible for a state-measured exam at the end of the school year. Principals were reminded to look at the Frequently Asked Question sheet provided by the researcher to clear up any possible misunderstandings for this section. These findings are presented in Table 4 on the next page.

Table 4

Teacher Characteristics (N=212)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Choice of Profession		
To become a teacher	129	60.8
A different profession	78	36.8
Teaching Position		
State-tested	79	37.3
Non-state-tested	75	35.4
Special education	22	10.4
Elective Teacher	35	16.5

The next section of the survey instrument consisted of six questions pertaining to principal leadership behaviors. These Likert-scale questions respond to Research Question 1. This section of the survey provided awareness of teachers' perceptions of their principals. Perceptions of principal leadership behaviors provided the researcher with information regarding how teachers feel they are treated by their principals. Participants were asked if administrators valued their decisions and if teachers felt supported, respected, and appreciated by their principals. Additionally, this section explored whether principals took an active role in the learning process, provided teachers with time to collaborate during the school day, and whether principals placed more pressure on state-measured subject area teachers.

Table 5 shows principal leadership behaviors. Although answers were varied, it indicates that administrators take an active role in the learning process and assist teachers in ways to improve instruction. This question held the strongest results based on the highest mean ($M = 3.75$). In response to teachers at this school having time to collaborate with department members during the school day, this question held the lowest results ($M = 3.44$), indicating that teachers need more time to plan. This section consisted of one reversed question which stated administrators place more pressure on state-tested subject area teachers. The data indicated ($M = 3.65$) and fell in the middle.

Table 5

Principal Leadership Behaviors (N=212)

Leadership Behaviors	Mean	SD
Administrators take active role.	3.75	.94
Teachers feel supported.	3.68	1.08
Administrators value teacher input.	3.67	1.02
*More pressure on state-tested subject area teachers	3.65	1.16
Administrators treat teachers fairly.	3.55	1.12
Teachers collaborate.	3.44	1.26

Note: Likert-scale 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree

* indicates reversed question.

The next section on the survey was teacher intention. This section did not work as a scale; therefore, only one question from this section was used to measure teacher intention in response to Research Question 1 and Research Question 3. Specifically, Question 16 asked teachers whether they planned to remain in the teaching profession next year. Participants were asked to rate all five questions in this section with a 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree. Teachers responded strongly to their intent to remain in the teaching profession next year ($M = 4.32$). However, when teachers responded to whether they planned on moving into administration within the next year or so, participants responded with ($M = 1.70$). Table 6 provides descriptive means regarding teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession.

Table 6

Teacher Intention (N=212)

Teacher Intention	Mean	SD
Plan to remain in teaching	4.32	.89
Would stay if not state-tested	2.85	1.23
Plan to teach different grade	2.00	1.14
Will move to different school	1.87	1.07
Will move into administration	1.70	1.04

Note: Likert-scale 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree

Teacher job satisfaction, Section 3 of the survey instrument, provided the researcher with data regarding Research Questions 2 and 3. Teachers believed that the pressure of high-stakes testing lends itself to burnout in this profession ($M = 4.27$). Contrary to that response in regard to low morale, ($M = 2.37$) teachers did not agree with

this reversed question in polarity, indicating teachers do not have low morale. Feeling appreciated by students and parents was a reversed question indicating teachers do feel appreciated ($M = 2.73$). Not pleased with salary was a reversed question that trended toward Agree. Not satisfied with work hours and experiencing burnout were reversed questions indicating neutrality. These descriptive statistics are found in Table 7.

Table 7

Teacher Job Satisfaction (N=212)

Teacher Job Satisfaction	Mean	SD
High-stakes lends to burnout	4.27	.89
Satisfied with subject area	4.13	.81
Appreciated by colleagues	4.03	.85
*Not pleased with salary	3.84	1.14
Active role in decisions	3.56	.99
Recognized for job well done	3.29	1.08
Can express my concerns	3.23	1.12
*Unsatisfied with work hours	3.18	1.16
*Experiencing burnout	3.15	1.28
Teachers have high morale.	3.14	1.02
Rewarded throughout the year	3.13	1.05
*Unappreciated by students	2.73	1.16
*I have low morale.	2.37	1.12

Note: Likert-scale 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree

*indicates reversed question.

Teacher mentoring and its effect on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession is the purpose for Table 8. Teachers were asked to rate mentoring and induction programs at their schools and whether principals were supportive of new teachers. Teachers rated these questions in response to Research Question 3. The results of this section indicated that teachers trended toward Agree when asked if principals were supportive of new teachers ($M = 3.93$). Contrary to this, in looking at the reversed question, participants did not believe teachers new to this school were not provided with necessary supplies to get them started in their classrooms ($M = 2.77$), indicating that teachers believed they were provided with the necessary supplies.

Table 8

Teacher Mentoring (N=212)

Teacher Mentoring	Mean	SD
Principals are not supportive of new teachers.	3.93	.86
District has induction program for new teachers.	3.45	1.10
New teachers are mentored.	3.15	1.10
*New teachers not provided with supplies.	2.77	1.20

Note: Likert-scale 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree

* indicates reversed question.

Table 9 displays intrinsic motivators. These motivators include challenges, rewards, and monetary incentives that may or may not motivate a teacher. Descriptive statistics on this last section of quantitative data indicated that teachers felt rewarded from within for teaching their students ($M = 4.23$). The question with the lowest mean was a reversed question in polarity ($M = 3.05$) indicating that teachers felt fairly neutral in terms of being rewarded monetarily for becoming a better teacher. This section of the survey did not behave as a scale in the final study.

Table 9

Intrinsic Motivators (N=212)

Intrinsic Motivators	Mean	SD
Teaching children at this age level is rewarding.	4.23	.77
I enjoy challenges.	4.19	.63
Rewards make me work harder.	3.52	1.05
*Monetary incentives do not motivate me.	3.05	1.27

Note: Likert-scale 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree

* indicates reversed question.

In examination of sections 2 through 6 of the survey instrument, including principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, and intrinsic motivators, teacher responses indicated that principal leadership had the greatest bearing on whether teachers would remain in the teaching profession

($M = 3.62$). Teacher mentoring, however, had the least effect on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession ($M = 3.44$). Neither teacher intent nor intrinsic motivators behaved as a scale both in the pilot and the full study. Table 10 indicates the data for these descriptives.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics of Mean Sub-scores (N=212)

Area	Mean	SD
Principal Leadership	3.62	.89
Teacher Job Satisfaction	3.28	.55
Teacher Mentoring	3.44	.75

Note: Likert-scale 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree

Hypothesis Results

Research Question 1 stated: Is there a relationship between principal leadership styles and behaviors and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession? In order to determine whether there was a correlation between teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession and principal leadership, a Pearson Correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession and principal leadership behaviors. A positive correlation was found $r(210) = .183, p = .008$, indicating a significant relationship between the two variables. Therefore, principal leadership styles and behaviors had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. This resulted in the researcher supporting Hypothesis 1 which stated: There is a statistically significant relationship between principal

leadership styles and teacher morale, teacher satisfaction, and teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession.

Research Question 2 stated: Is there a difference in the levels of teacher job satisfaction between teachers of state-measured subject areas and teachers of non-state-measured subject areas? An independent *t*-test was calculated comparing the mean scores of teacher job satisfaction for state-measured subject area teachers and non-state-measured subject area teachers. Based on the results in Table 11, there is not a significant difference between the two groups of teachers $t(210) = 1.433, p = .153$. The mean of non-state-measured subject area teachers ($M = 3.32, SD = .57$) was not significantly higher than the mean for state-measured subject area teachers ($M = 3.21, SD = .52$). This resulted in the researcher rejecting Hypothesis 2 which stated: There is a statistically significant difference between state-measured subject area teachers' and non-state-measured subject area teachers' intent to remain in the profession.

Table 11

State-measured and Non-state-measured Teacher Job Satisfaction

Factor	Teacher Group	N	Mean	SD
Teacher Job Satisfaction	Non-state-measured	133	3.32	.57
	State-measured	79	3.21	.52

Research Question 3 stated: Is there a relationship between teacher job satisfaction, teacher morale, and teacher mentoring programs and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession? Hypothesis 1 states: There is a statistically significant

relationship between principal leadership styles and behaviors and teacher morale, teacher satisfaction, and teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession. A simple linear regression was calculated predicting teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession based on their perceptions of teacher mentoring and teacher job satisfaction. The model summary reported the variability explained by the model as 77%. A significant regression equation was found as indicated in the regression table, $F(2, 209) = 8.697, p < .001, R^2$ of .077, indicating there is a relationship between teacher mentoring and teacher job satisfaction in relation to teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. The findings support the hypothesis. The results indicate that the intent to remain is predicted by teacher mentoring and teacher satisfaction. As reflected in Table 12, teacher job satisfaction had the strongest influence, and teacher mentoring had the least influence on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Teacher job satisfaction was a positive predictor, and teacher mentoring was a negative predictor.

Table 12

Regression Coefficients for Predicting Intent to Remain

	Unstandardized		Standardized		
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.88	.37		7.74	.001
Teacher Job					
Satisfaction	.461	.12	.29	3.72	.001
Teacher					
Mentoring	-.022	.09	-.02	-.24	.81

Qualitative Data Analysis

In the last section of the survey instrument, participants were asked to provide the researcher with self-reported factors that contributed to teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession. These responses addressed Research Question 4: Is there a difference between self-reported factors that contribute to teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession? Of the 212 participants who completed and returned the survey instrument 205 responded to the qualitative questions. This accounted for a 97% response rate. The response rate based on the 501 surveys that were distributed among districts was 72%. Specifically, a total of 109 high school teachers, 38 middle school teachers, and 58 elementary school teachers responded to some questions or the entire qualitative portion of the survey instrument.

In examining the first open-ended question in the qualitative section of the survey instrument, the researcher found that 56 of 59 elementary teachers, 35 of 39 middle school teachers, and 106 of 114 high school teachers responded to this question. The results led to the following percentages: 95% of elementary teachers, 90% of middle school teachers, and 93% of high school teachers responded to this question. Overall, 197 of 212 teachers responded to this question. Therefore, this question accounted for a 93% response rate when combining all teachers' responses. The question specifically asked: Which factor contributes greatest to a teacher's wanting to remain in the teaching profession? The researcher examined all respondents' answers to determine which answers were most frequently used.

The researcher was interested in examining respondents' answers, to determine why teachers in this study remained in the profession. In using the constant comparative

method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), the researcher used multiple phases of analyzing data. Methods included collecting data, refining the data, and categorizing it into tables. The data showed three significant themes in response to the research question: student success, subject matter, and teaching.

Student Success

The overwhelming majority of teachers reported that student success was the reason they remained in the teaching profession. This was exemplified in previous literature. For example, Manuel and Hughes (2006) found that “teaching and learning, at its core, is about relationships and connections between teachers and students: accomplished teachers and new teachers, schools and communities; hopes and their realization; and aspirations and their fulfillment” (p. 22). Most teachers, in this study, indicated that they remain in education because they like to see students learn and grow academically. For example, one participant said, “Student achievement: seeing them go from one stage to another and knowing that learning has occurred and can be applied.” Another participant stated, “Seeing students learn and be able to solve problems they never thought they were capable of,” and, “I believe that seeing a child learn and grow is the reason for teachers wanting to remain in this profession,” was stated by another teacher.

Subject Matter

Teachers believe that their subject matter and the enjoyment they receive from seeing students learning it is what makes them remain in education. Curtis (2012) noted as many as 70% of the teachers in his study remained in education because they enjoyed teaching their subject. Likewise, the teacher participants in this study confirmed the

scholarship. For example, one participant noted, “The teacher must have a passion for the subject he/she teaches and be able to set aside the fact that he/she will work countless hours for minimal pay.” Another teacher added, “Love of subject-matter, courses taught.”

Teaching

Many teachers in this study indicated that they enjoy educating the minds of young people, and that is why they remain in the teaching profession. In her study, Yost (2006) noted that teachers who persevere and move forward despite obstacles are “both resilient and persistent” (p. 59) thus, indicating those who enjoy teaching continue in the profession regardless of daily challenges. Likewise, one participant in this study confirmed this scholarship by stating, “If we could just teach and stop all the dog and pony show.” Another participant said, “Most teachers stay because it is their passion, and they love teaching. It isn’t about any rewards, the money, etc.” One more teacher stated, “I would teach forever if my classroom was actually my classroom without all of the regulations from the state.”

In examining the second open-ended question in the qualitative section of the survey instrument, the researcher found that 55 of 59 elementary teachers, 36 of 39 middle school teachers, and 107 of 114 high school teachers responded to this question. The results led to the following percentages: 93% of elementary teachers, 92% of middle school teachers, and 94% of high school teachers responded to this question. Overall, 198 of 212 teachers answered this question. Therefore, when combining all teachers’ responses, this question accounted for a 93% response rate. The question specifically asked: Which factor contributes greatest to a teacher’s decision to leave the teaching

profession? The question was included in the survey for the purpose of examining why teachers leave the teaching profession. Three themes emerged from an analysis of the qualitative data: lack of administrative support, teacher workload, and student discipline.

Lack of Administrative Support

In a study conducted on administrative influence and its effects on teacher retention, teachers felt that administrative support was a key indicator as to whether teachers would remain or leave the teaching profession (Prather-Jones, 2011). In this study, teachers confirmed the literature. One teacher noted, “Feelings of not being respected by students and administration; heavy class preparation; lack of principal’s help to deal with disruptive students.” Another respondent said, “The idea that no matter how hard a teacher works, he or she will never do enough to satisfy everyone (parents, administration).” Likewise, another participant responded with, “Asking questions of administration for the betterment of the students. Due to the regulations put on administration, they are forced to say *No* more now than ever before.” “I think lack of respect from parents and administrators erode morale,” concluded one teacher.

Teacher Workload

According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2005), teachers have many demands placed upon them such as teaching students, planning lessons, completing paperwork, and counseling students. In examining teachers’ responses in this study and confirming what the literature conveyed, one teacher reported, “Burnout due to the increased amounts of paperwork and the pressures of testing, testing, and more testing.” Another participant responded with, “Being overwhelmed by the responsibilities and no time to get it all done- unless after

school hours.” One more teacher stated, “Lack of salary, too many restrictions placed on a teacher with unrealistic expectations- a teacher can only do so much!”

Student Discipline

Brill and McCartney (2008) noted that student behavior should be considered when examining teacher attrition. Likewise, teacher responses in this study confirmed the scholarship on student discipline. For example, one teacher said, “Rude disrespectful teenagers. Parents that do not see that their children are wrong—EVER.” Another participant stated, “The fact that the vast majority of students don’t care, can’t be held accountable, and it ends up being the teacher’s responsibility to pass the buck.” These responses indicate how strongly teachers feel about discipline.

The third open-ended question asked if teachers had ever left the teaching profession. Data indicated that 58 of 59 elementary teachers, 37 of 39 middle school teachers, and 110 of 114 high school teachers responded to this question. The results led to the following percentages: 98% of elementary teachers, 95% of middle school teachers, and 96% of high school teachers responded to this question. Overall, 205 of 212 teachers responded to this question. This question accounted for a 97% response rate. The question specifically asked: Have you ever left the teaching profession? If so, please provide an explanation.

Further analysis of the question included those who responded with a yes, no, or left it blank. Data indicated that 11 of 59 elementary school teachers, 11 of 39 middle school teachers, and 23 of 114 high school teachers responded “Yes”. Percentages include 19% of elementary teachers, 28% of middle school teachers, and 20% of high school teachers have left the teaching profession at least one time in their teaching career.

Of the calculated yes responses, one high school teacher stated, “I am leaving after this year.” Responses indicated that 45 of 212 teachers replied with a “Yes.” In all, 21% of teachers have left and returned to the teaching profession.

Many educators do not find the teaching profession to be a satisfying experience, and they realize that the only way to advance is to leave the teaching profession or go into administration (NCTAF, 2007). For the 21% of teachers in this study who left the profession and returned, most of them stated personal reasons and lack of job satisfaction in the workplace. Those who left for personal reasons mainly cited health problems, birth of child, divorce, and loss of home after Hurricane Katrina.

The overwhelming majority of respondents who have left and returned to teaching cited reasons similar to the following: “Torn between home responsibilities (feeling like I had nothing left when I got home- my own children did not get the best of me....or any of me on some days) and workload that only grew.” A male high school teacher stated that he was, “Left in state testing classes for 7 straight years; then punished because of my success by being given *more* SATP classes. (Mediocrity is rewarded with no SATP classes.)” Another participant added, “I dropped out at the end of the 2010-2011 school year. I needed a break and had burned out due to stagnation and no administrative support whatsoever. I returned after a much needed respite.” And lastly, a state-measured subject area elementary school teacher responded with, “Being told ‘how’ to teach and given scripted lessons—I didn’t feel like I was teaching.”

In analyzing data for those respondents who answered no, the researcher found that 47 of 59 elementary teachers, 26 of 39 middle school teachers, and 87 of 114 high teachers marked “No” as their response. Specifically, that means 80% of elementary,

67% of middle school, and 76% of high school teachers in this study have never left the teaching profession. This data showed that 160 of all 212 teachers responded with a “No.” In all, 76% of the teachers in this study have never left the teaching profession. The researcher noted that 3% of the 212 teachers in this study did not respond to this question.

In examining the fourth open-ended question in the qualitative section of the survey instrument, the researcher found that 56 of 59 elementary teachers, 37 of 39 middle school teachers, and 103 of 114 high school teachers responded to this question. The results led to the following percentages: 95% of elementary teachers, 95% of middle school teachers, and 90% of high school teachers responded to this question. Overall, 196 of 212 teachers answered this question. Therefore, when combining all teachers’ responses, this question accounted for a 92% response rate. The question specifically asked: If a college student asked you the primary reason you became a teacher, what reason would you give? The researcher examined all respondents’ answers to determine which answers were most frequently used.

Almost all teachers responded to this section with a similar response: love of students and teaching. Leithwood and McAdie (2007) claimed “the primary purpose for school structures is to make possible the development and maintenance of cultures that support the work of teachers and the learning of students” (p. 10), a claim that is supported by teacher responses in this study. As one teacher noted, “I’ve always wanted to teach, I love my subject area, and I’ve always been able to easily explain it to others.”

Teachers in this study consistently supported previous literature by reporting their perceptions on becoming a teacher. For example, a state-measured subject area middle

school teacher noted, “To give back to the community and to serve—‘It takes a village...’ All children deserve a chance to succeed. Now, I would say don’t do it,” meaning that she once enjoyed teaching; however, now she would tell a college student not to go into the teaching profession. Another participant, an elementary teacher, explained that she became a teacher, “For the Ah-Ha moment when a child learns a new skill.” A middle school special education teacher stated that she wanted to “Touch the future; defend the academically disadvantaged (below grade levels).” A male high school teacher, who has once left the teaching profession and returned to it, stated, “For the very few that *Really* want to learn, it’s almost enough to stay.”

In examining the last open-ended question in the qualitative section of the survey instrument, the researcher found that 47 of 59 elementary teachers, 35 of 39 middle school teachers, and 101 of 114 high school teachers responded to this question. The results led to the following percentages: 80% of elementary teachers, 90% of middle school teachers, and 89% of high school teachers responded to this question. Overall, 183 of 212 teachers answered this question. Therefore, when combining all teachers’ responses, this question accounted for an 86% response rate. The question specifically asked: As you teach during a typical school day, what three (3) things bother you the most about the teaching profession?

The researcher examined all respondents’ answers to determine a frequent theme. The most frequently noted factors were student discipline, paperwork, and pressures of state-testing. Kipps-Vaughan (2013) found that previous studies indicate approximately one-quarter of teachers experience stress in the teaching profession, a figure that should concern principals because the consequence of teacher stress could affect student

achievement. Teachers in this study confirmed the literature by sharing their perceptions of what bothers them most in the teaching profession, factors that could be contributing to teacher stress. For example, one state-measured subject area high school teacher cited,

Using valuable time on paperwork that serves little purpose, the focus on standardized tests that do not prepare students for college or the workforce, and students biding their time because our current system does not offer any path other than college.

Another teacher who had indicated that he would choose another profession if he could go back to college said, “State-test teachers get paid the same as everyone else (even Driver’s Ed.), student apathy is a huge struggle and parents don’t care, and education is outdated to technology.” An elementary teacher said the three things that bother her most are, “Discipline, parents who want you to fix the mess they created, and teacher workdays filled with meetings, and you can’t *WORK* in your classroom,” thus indicating that workdays really are not intended for teachers to work in their rooms.

Ancillary Findings

In addition to the four research questions that were analyzed, there was one additional finding that was beneficial to this study. In this finding, there was a breakdown of teachers who left the teaching profession. This was found in the qualitative portion of the research study. Of those who left the teaching profession and returned, 11 were male, and 34 were female. Based on the data presented in this study, 11 of 59 elementary school teachers, 11 of 39 middle school teachers, and 23 of 114 high school teachers have left and returned to the teaching profession at least once if not more than once in their career. These numbers resulted in the following percentages: 19% of

elementary school teachers, 28% of middle school teachers, and 20% of high school teachers have left and returned to the teaching profession. In calculating all of the teachers in this study who have left the teaching profession and returned 45 of 212 teachers responded with “Yes” indicating that 21% have left the profession and returned. This indicated to the researcher that factors such as, but not limited to, job security and not being successful in other ventures brought teachers back into the teaching profession, as conveyed by participant responses.

Summary

Using a quantitative study with a qualitative component to survey K-12 teachers, this study was designed to examine the effects of leadership and high-stakes testing with regard to teachers’ intent to remain in the teaching profession. Additionally, it was designed to examine which factors contribute most to teachers’ intent. The survey instrument, which was developed by the researcher, included teacher demographics, principal leadership styles and behaviors, teachers’ intent, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, intrinsic motivators, and self-reported factors that contribute to teachers’ intent to remain or leave the teaching profession. With forty-one Likert-scale type questions and five open-ended questions, the survey yielded both quantitative and qualitative data. Data were examined for each section of the survey, and the researcher recorded all data for statistical significance or emerging themes. The nature of the open-ended questions in the qualitative section made this study more robust, as it provided the researcher with true perceptions of teachers in south Mississippi.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine whether principal leadership styles and behaviors and the demands of high-stakes tests had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Perceptions of teachers concerning the contributing factors that led to their intent to remain in the teaching profession were also examined. This study examined whether principal leadership styles and behaviors had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. It also examined whether there was a difference in teacher job satisfaction levels for state-measured subject area teachers and non-state-measured subject area teachers and whether there was a relationship between teacher job satisfaction, teacher morale, and teacher mentoring programs and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Self-reported factors were analyzed in the qualitative section of the survey instrument. Teachers in this study were from public schools in south Mississippi serving students K-12 grades. Survey data included both quantitative and qualitative data. Chapter V includes a summary of procedures, major findings, discussion of the findings, limitations of the study, recommendations for policy or practice, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of Procedures

In examining the data for this study, several conclusions can be made about the research. Principals and superintendents from seven schools in three school districts in south Mississippi participated in this research study. The researcher developed a seven-section survey that addressed teacher demographics, principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, intrinsic motivators, and

self-reported factors. A panel of experts comprised of four administrators and one teacher reviewed the survey instrument and provided the researcher with clarity and content validity. Following this procedure, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for The University of Southern Mississippi granted approval of the study. Upon receiving approval from IRB, the researcher sent letters to principals and educators in approved schools and districts. The researcher then conducted a pilot study in which 12 participants responded to the survey instrument which consisted of 46 questions, measuring both quantitative and qualitative data. Results from the pilot study were entered into SPSS version 20, and a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient test was used to examine the reliability of the survey instrument. Reliabilities of at least .689 were recorded for all sections except teacher intention and intrinsic motivators. The teacher intention scale and intrinsic motivators scale did not work; however, both sections remained on the survey. Since the teacher intention section did not work as a scale, only question 16 was used to measure intention. Specifically, this question asked teachers if they planned to remain in the teaching profession next year.

Upon receiving permission to conduct the study in a school district, the researcher hand delivered all surveys to principals or principal designees. The researcher asked principals to provide faculty members with a copy of the survey. The principal administered the questionnaire during a faculty meeting, department meeting, or a time that each faculty deemed appropriate. Upon completion of the surveys, the principal or designee collected the surveys and put them in a manila envelope. The researcher was contacted via email or a phone call from each school principal or designee to confirm completion of surveys. The researcher collected the surveys from each school in a sealed

envelope in order to compile data for the study. School districts were given the opportunity to request a summary of the data upon completion of the dissertation process.

The researcher distributed a total of 501 surveys to schools but received only 212 completed surveys during the spring semester of the 2013-2014 school year. Upon receiving surveys from respondents, the researcher input raw data in an Excel spreadsheet. The data were then entered into SPSS version 20 and analyzed with descriptive statistics, an independent *t*-test, a Pearson Correlation, and simple linear regression. Qualitative data were recorded by hand and then put into Microsoft Word tables for the researcher to clearly examine participants' answers to self-reported factors. Throughout the constant-comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), the researcher used data reduction, the simplification of data throughout the analysis, and coded data through open coding, axial coding, and selective coding as previously mentioned in Chapter IV.

Major Findings

In order for the researcher to examine teachers' intent, the researcher collected and analyzed demographic data pertaining to teacher characteristics, principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, intrinsic motivators, and self-reported factors which contributed greatest to teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. The findings for this study came from K-12 public school teachers in south Mississippi. The majority of teachers surveyed in this study were females. Most teachers ranged in age from 30-39 years and had 11-20 years of teaching experience. In looking at formal education, half of the teachers held a bachelor's degree with approximately 4% less than that holding a master's degree,

leaving almost half of all teachers holding a master's degree. This finding could lend itself to the belief that teachers may be trying to maximize their salaries by attaining a higher degree.

Almost all teachers reported being highly qualified according to Mississippi Department of Education guidelines, but only a small percentage were National Board Certified. This was an interesting finding because teachers get paid \$6000 a year for ten years if they are National Board Certified in the state of Mississippi (NBPTS, 2013). Additional findings indicated that most teachers, if given the chance to go back to college, would choose the teaching profession again. This was an interesting finding based on the amount of dissatisfaction some teachers indicated on their surveys. Most teachers, who responded to this survey, were non-state-measured subject area teachers, possibly indicating that state-measured subject area teachers did not have time to complete the survey due to fulfilling rigid demands such as data compilation and data meetings. In reading and interpreting all descriptive statistics, teacher demographics were important to the study based on the research questions presented.

In analyzing descriptive statistical information, teacher perceptions indicated that administrators place more pressure on state-measured subject area teachers. Although this question did not indicate strong agreement, over half of teacher responses trended toward Agree. This was an interesting finding based on the fact that the majority of teachers in this study were non-state-measured subject area teachers. This indicates that all teachers in the study were aware of demands placed on those teachers who teach subjects with standardized tests. In examining teacher intention, most teachers indicated that they plan to remain in the teaching profession next year. Again, this could be due to

the fact that the majority of those surveyed were non-state-measured subject area teachers. Another interesting finding was that when looking at teacher job satisfaction, most teachers agreed that the pressure of high-stakes testing lends itself to burnout in this profession. Kohn (2000) noted that many teachers are leaving the teaching profession because of test pressures and accountability placed on teachers.

When analyzing teacher mentoring factors, the researcher found that principals were supportive of new teachers. This information was beneficial to this study because previous scholarship found that novice teachers often cite lack of administrative support as their primary reason for leaving the teaching profession (Robertson, Hancock, & Allen, 2006). In determining which factors teachers felt strongly about when responding to intrinsic motivators, teachers specified that teaching at their current grade level was rewarding to them. Ryan and Deci (2000) indicated that in order for a person to be intrinsically motivated, that person had to be motivated by challenges or for the excitement of doing something, not for external rewards. According to the data in this study, based on teacher responses, teachers appeared to be more motivated to accomplish goals than receive rewards.

In looking at the descriptive data, readers should be cautious when interpreting the results on teacher intent and intrinsic motivators, as those sections resulted in low reliability. The reliability in those two areas was lower than the cut-off value of .70. Low reliability scores could have been correlated to the wording of survey questions or the use of reverse questions, which may have confused some participants. Questions 15, 21, 24, 25, 27, 32, 35, and 40 were reversed in polarity; however, they were reported on the descriptive tables as unreversed. They were then reversed before composite scores

were produced and used in the analyses. Questions are as follows: 15) Administrators place more pressure on state-tested subject area teachers, 21) I do not feel appreciated by students and their parents, 24) I am not pleased with my salary, 25) I am experiencing burnout in this profession, 27) I am not satisfied with the amount of hours I work each week, 32) I have low morale, 35) Teachers new to this school are not provided with necessary supplies to get them started in their classrooms, and 40) Monetary incentives do not motivate me to become a better teacher.

Additional major findings that are associated with the hypotheses include the following. Research Question 1 asked if there was a relationship between principal leadership styles and behaviors and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. The Pearson Correlation used to test Hypothesis 1 indicated that there was a significant difference in principal leadership styles and behaviors based on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. This finding indicated that principal leadership is a critical factor in the retention of teachers and suggests that administrators should consider their leadership styles and behaviors when leading others in the field of education.

T-test data were used to test Hypothesis 2 with regard to Research Question 2, which asked if there was a difference in the levels of teacher job satisfaction between teachers of state-measured subject areas and teachers of non-state-measured subject areas. As previously mentioned, Hypothesis 2 stated: There is a statistically significant difference between state-measured subject area teachers' and non-state-measured subject area teachers' intent to remain in the profession. In examining the Independent Samples Test, there was not a statistically significant difference between state-measured and non-state-measured teachers when looking at teacher job satisfaction. In comparing the

means, there was no difference in state-measured and non-state-measured teacher job satisfaction. This finding indicated that both non-state-measured teachers and state-measured subject area teachers expressed similar perceptions with regard to teacher job satisfaction and intent to remain in the profession.

Research Question 3 asked if there was a relationship between teacher job satisfaction, teacher morale, and teacher mentoring programs and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. In order to predict teacher intention, the researcher used simple linear regression to determine if teacher job satisfaction and teacher mentoring had an effect on teachers' intent to remain in the profession. Results indicated a significant relationship. Consistent with past literature on teacher retention, when the combination of factors such as mentoring and induction programs were employed in schools, teachers became more satisfied with the profession, and retention improved (Ingersoll, 2012). Teacher job satisfaction was a positive predictor, meaning if teachers are satisfied in their jobs, they are more likely to remain in the teaching profession. These findings suggested that the researcher supported Hypothesis 1 with regard to Research Question 3.

The qualitative component of the survey instrument provided the researcher with interesting teacher perceptions. This section of the survey was titled Self-reported Factors. The five open-ended questions asked teachers which factors contributed greatest to teacher retention and attrition, as well as if teachers had ever left the teaching profession, the primary reason for becoming a teacher and which factors bothered them most during a typical school day. With almost all participants responding to these questions, responses indicated that teachers were passionate about answering this section

of the survey. Many teachers wrote beyond the allotted space for survey answers. These questions and answers were in response to Research Question 4: Is there a difference between self-reported factors that contribute to teachers' intent to remain or leave the teaching profession?

The first open-ended question asked: Which factor contributes greatest to a teacher's wanting to remain in the teaching profession? Most teachers stated they remained in education because of student success, enjoyment of subject area, and the art of teaching. This finding is confirmed in Ryan and Deci's (2000) study which suggested that "to be motivated means to be moved to do something" (p.54). Teachers in this study indicated that they remained in this profession because they were motivated to teach children.

With regard to the second open-ended question, "Which factor contributes greatest to a teacher's decision to leave the teaching profession," teachers reported lack of administrative support, teacher workload, and student discipline as the three strongest indicators of teachers leaving the profession. Teacher responses confirmed information found in previous studies such as Ingersoll's (2004) study, which found that job dissatisfaction accounted for nearly 40% of teachers departing high poverty schools, with lack of administrative support being a contributing factor to teacher job dissatisfaction. This finding suggested that teachers rely heavily on administrative support as daily influences in their teaching professions.

When asked whether they had ever left the teaching profession, 21% of teachers surveyed had left and returned to the teaching profession. Most of the teachers left for personal reasons and lack of job satisfaction. In analyzing job satisfaction, they stated

that teachers were required to do many extra duties in addition to their main goal, which should be teaching students. Responses revealed a strong indication that teachers feel overwhelmed in fulfilling their daily responsibilities to the extent that they were willing to leave the teaching profession altogether. As confirmed in previous research, the emphasis on better practices in classrooms may be a current focus in education, but this will only be beneficial to schools if they recruit and retain strong teachers in the teaching profession (Cochran-Smith et al., 2011).

The next open-ended question asked: If a college student asked you the primary reason you became a teacher, what reason would you give? The majority of teachers believed that they were in this profession for the love of students and teaching, strongly confirming past scholarship in this area. Curtis (2012) found that 71% of teachers entered the profession for the enjoyment of teaching, 70% enjoyed the subject, and 66% enjoyed working with children. Several of the respondents in this study remarked about their love for teaching, enjoyment of their particular subject area, and working with students. This question may have sparked enthusiasm in reflecting upon why teachers first entered the teaching profession. When teachers feel connected to their teaching responsibilities and passionate about what they are doing, claimed Curtis (2012), they may form a channel that improves retention rates among educators, especially those who teach math.

The final open-ended question asked: As you teach during a typical school day, what three things bother you the most about the teaching profession? This finding included student discipline, paperwork, and pressures of state-testing as three significant factors that bothered teachers the most. Teachers felt that student discipline was out of

control and limited the effectiveness of their teaching due to the many behavioral issues they encountered daily. Excessive paperwork bothered teachers because they felt as though they had to put more time and effort in completing meaningless data forms, recording student documentation with regard to discipline and differentiated instruction, grading papers, creating lesson plans and tests, and maintaining parent phone logs. They believed that if they could just focus on teaching, they would be more successful, and the data would prove it. The pressure of state-testing was frequently noted as a factor that bothered teachers. Teachers felt that policy makers made decisions that affected educators, and it bothered teachers that so many mandates had been placed on them. Furthermore, teachers felt pressure to fulfill obligations that sometimes felt unobtainable for many of them because of these mandates. The pressures of standardized tests requires teachers to focus more of their instruction on test material (Pedulla et al., 2003), and these test pressures could be a major cause for dissatisfaction among Mississippi public school teachers.

In examining all statistical findings in this study with regard to significance, it was indicated that principal leadership styles and behaviors had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession, state-measured and non-state-measured subject area teachers' perceptions did not have a significant impact on teacher job satisfaction, and there was a significant relationship between teacher job satisfaction and teacher mentoring on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Descriptive statistics suggested that principal leadership had the strongest bearing on whether teachers would remain in the teaching profession, whereas teacher mentoring and teacher job satisfaction had the least effect on teachers' intent to remain. Although teachers

expressed their frustrations and dissatisfactions with regard to the teaching profession, only two state-measured and seven non-state-measured subject area teachers of the 212 teachers surveyed in this study reported that they would not return to the teaching profession next year. Of the 57 novice teachers in this study, 18 were state-measured subject area teachers. Only two of those teachers stated that they would not return to the teaching profession next year.

Discussion

With NCLB (2001) mandates and pressures of everyday teaching responsibilities, teachers are becoming more dissatisfied with the profession and leaving due to the excessive demands placed on them (Kopkowski, 2008). Current legislation in Mississippi is consistent with the demands already placed on teachers, as legislators are now calling for teachers to meet benchmarks in order to receive future pay raises (Mississippi Legislature, 2014). The pay raises will take place throughout the next four years. In addition to teachers meeting benchmark criteria, the governor of Mississippi is proposing merit pay, which will likely be linked to student achievement on standardized test scores (Mississippi Legislature, 2014). These legislative actions, if passed, could create more frustrations for teachers. Some of these educators, who may already feel overworked, would have to contend with meeting benchmarks in order to receive pay raises.

Previous scholarship indicates that within the past two decades, the U.S. has changed its way of tracking schools' performance, with more emphasis placed on standardized tests as a means for measuring schools' success rather than traditional methods of tracking such as seat time and required courses (Supovitz, 2010). With test

scores looming over their heads and demands from school principals, teachers in this study suggested they are having difficulty fulfilling daily obligations. Excessive paperwork, pressures of standardized tests, and a plethora of data meetings were a few of the frustrations described by teachers in south Mississippi. As one teacher described when asked about what bothered her most about the teaching profession, “Training and meetings during my planning period, student apathy, increased pressure of Common Core, assigned useless tasks that distract me from planning, and lack of professional training opportunities in my subject area.”

The goal of this study was to examine whether principal leadership behaviors and the demands of high-stakes tests had an impact on teachers’ intent to remain in the teaching profession. Teachers’ perceptions concerning the contributing factors that led to teachers’ intent to remain in the teaching profession were also examined. The additional factors such as teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, and intrinsic motivators were analyzed. Overall, the results from this study suggest that the majority of both state-measured and non-state-measured subject area teachers plan to remain in the teaching profession. These results were indicative of elementary school, middle school, high school, state-measured, and non-state-measured teachers. Results could indicate that teachers although frustrated plan to remain in the teaching profession because the majority of them have not invested enough years in the state retirement system. Moreover, because most of them have already invested the 11-20 years in the profession, they may remain because they want to receive the future benefits of retirement, for which they have already invested so many years. For example, when asked why a teacher remains in this profession, one middle school teacher wrote, “Years in the profession (too

close to retirement to leave).” This could explain why so many teachers in this study intend to remain.

Many of the findings in this study support previous literature as found in Chapter II. Research suggests that teachers’ working conditions and administrative support would significantly assist in solving the teacher shortage (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). In examining descriptive statistics subscales, the mean value for principal leadership was the highest when compared to teacher job satisfaction and teacher mentoring. This finding suggests that leadership styles and administrative support do have an impact on teachers’ intent to remain in this profession. In addressing teacher attrition and the principal’s role in schools, Greenlee and Brown (2009) found that teachers leave primarily due to their working conditions and lack of administrative support. When compiling self-reported factors in the qualitative section of the survey and looking at perceptions of leadership in the quantitative section of the survey, teachers strongly indicated the importance of good principal leadership in schools.

The findings on principal leadership behaviors suggest that administrators do take an active role in the learning process and assist teachers in ways to improve instruction. Most teachers, in this section of the survey, reported that they feel supported, respected, and appreciated by administrators. Consistently throughout the quantitative portion of the survey results, teachers reported satisfaction with principal leadership. Their answers varied, however, when they expressed their perceptions in the qualitative section. Varied perceptions could have been due to limiting their responses to perceptions of their current administration only and not how they perceived previous administrators. When asked if administrators place more pressure on state-tested subject area teachers, teachers trended

toward the Agree response, thus possibly indicating non-state-measured teachers share the same way opinion as state-measured teachers.

Overall, when looking at teacher job satisfaction in this study, results suggested that teachers believed the pressure of high-stakes testing lends itself to burnout in the profession. These findings are consistent with research in Chapter II which stated teaching strains may be caused from high-stakes testing and stressors that are associated with test preparation, procedures, and accountability (Hahs-Vaughn & Scherff, 2008). Goldstein and Beutel (2009) claimed that because teachers have been scrutinized and blamed for standardized test results, this bears a negative effect on teachers and their desire to motivate students (Farber, 2010). Although a few teachers in this study reported major dissatisfaction without the intent to remain in this profession, the majority indicated a fair amount of satisfaction within the teaching profession when examining the quantitative portion of the survey. However, when asked about the self-reported factors that contributed to teachers leaving the profession, teachers clearly indicated what bothered them most about the teaching profession, therefore, making the qualitative portion of the survey critical to examining real teacher perceptions of teacher job satisfaction.

As discussed in Chapter IV, when examining teacher job satisfaction in the self-reported factors section, teachers were most bothered by lack of administrative support (which contradicted their views on administrative support in the principal leadership behaviors section and the teacher mentoring section of the survey), teacher workload, student discipline, paperwork, and pressures of state-testing. Fatima (2012) claimed that in order for teachers to become effective in the classroom, they must first be satisfied

with their job. Fatima suggested the school as a whole will benefit from their effectiveness if teachers are satisfied with their jobs.

Teachers in this study provided the researcher with beneficial responses despite the wording of some questions. In examining the answer choices given in the quantitative section of the survey, the researcher found that self-reported factors provided more robust answers because teachers expressed in their own words how they felt about teaching. Overall, teachers indicated they were fairly satisfied with their jobs; however, they appeared eager in expressing their frustrations with the researcher.

The findings in this research reflect no difference in teacher job satisfaction for state-measured and non-state-measured subject area teachers. As noted previously in this chapter, these results could indicate that because fewer state-measured subject area teachers were surveyed, results may have been skewed. Prior research in this area does not support the findings in this survey on state-measured and non-state-measured teacher opinions. Rubin (2011) indicated that teachers of ELA have increased expectations placed on them in comparison to teachers of non-state-measured subject areas. As a result of this, he stated that national reform efforts are harming teachers' commitment to the profession (Rubin, 2011). Leithwood and McAdie (2007) suggested that when teachers perceive their workload to be disproportionate to another's workload, job satisfaction becomes a problem, and teachers are apt to leave the teaching profession in pursuit of other employment opportunities.

The subscale results for teacher mentoring could have indicated that teachers either were not aware of mentoring and induction programs in their schools, or they may have not deemed it a critical component in retaining teachers. Results indicated that

approximately one quarter of surveyed teachers reported Neutral responses on this section. According to previous studies and unlike other professions, teaching has not typically offered quality induction programs that foster new teacher development, thus creating a problem with teacher retention (Ingersoll, 2012).

In investigating the teacher mentoring section, the researcher found that teachers indicated principals are supportive of new teachers. This finding is consistent with prior literature which supports the idea of administrators being strong influences on teachers' intent to remain in the profession (Brown & Wynn, 2009). Research in this area states the ultimate goal of mentoring and induction programs is to retain and improve performance for new teachers in the teaching profession while improving the performance of student growth and achievement (Ingersoll, 2012). In comparison to past studies on new teacher support (Ingersoll, 2012; Kang & Berliner, 2012), about 75% of new teachers recently reported that schools supported them by providing helpful mentor teachers and useful induction programs (Scherer, 2012).

As mentioned in Chapter III, the scales did not work for teacher intention and intrinsic motivators. This could be due to the wording of the questions in those sections of the survey. Although the scales were not used, a key question was used in the analysis of data. "I plan to remain in the teaching profession," was used as the dependent variable when running statistical tests. Contrary to prior scholarship on retention rates, very few teachers in this study indicated that they would leave the teaching profession at the end of this school year. Prior studies indicated that on average, the turnover rate for novice teachers within their first three years of teaching was 33 percent, and after five years, this figure increased to 46% (NCTAF, 2007). Teachers in this study did not agree with

previous literature pertaining to retention rates as only two novice teachers reported that they would not return to the teaching profession.

The results of this study reflected the theoretical foundations found in Chapter II. As found in the literature and respondents' perceptions, both the Two-Factor Theory and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs impact teachers' job satisfaction and intent to remain in the teaching profession. The Two-Factor Theory provides an explanation of job factors that are either satisfying or dissatisfying for teachers. The motivational-hygiene model states that employee motivation is accomplished when employees are provided with challenging yet gratifying work that allows employees to achieve success (Dartey-Baah, 2011). Furthermore, this theory states motivation as an indicator of job satisfaction and hygiene as an indicator of job dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). Teachers reported student success, love of students and teaching, and subject matter as the three most important factors. These results indicate the motivation theory relates to teachers' perceptions because teachers were intrinsically motivated, thereby contributing to their satisfaction and intent to remain in the teaching profession.

Hygiene factors that are extrinsic include factors such as salary, interpersonal relations, job security, working conditions, and factors in personal life (Herzberg et al. 1959; Herzberg, 1987). Teachers in this study reported several factors pertaining to extrinsic motivators. Factors included leaving the profession for personal reasons, working conditions that leave teachers feeling overwhelmed, and lack of administrative support. Although the intrinsic motivators scale did not work in this study, possibly due to the wording of questions, teacher responses suggest the two-factor theory has an

impact on whether teachers are satisfied in the profession and whether they intend to remain in the profession.

In examining teacher job satisfaction, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory also impacts teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Fatima (2012) asserted that employee satisfaction is important if employees want their businesses to be successful, and in order to establish job satisfaction, it is important to know what causes employee stress. Overall data indicated teachers trending toward the Agree response when looking at principal leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction, with teacher job satisfaction falling lowest in descriptives subscales. When reporting self-reported factors, teachers clearly indicated what bothered them most, but some of the reported findings go beyond what a principal can do to improve teacher job satisfaction.

Maslow (1954) believed that basic needs had to be met before a person could experience growth. As teachers progress through the stages in their profession, their needs become more complex. When employers make the effort to meet the needs of their employees, they often produce positive results (Cannon, 2013). Qualitative results indicated that teachers' needs were not being met. Teachers stated that they needed more planning time, more support from parents and administrators, more resources, and more student accountability, thus suggesting that these teachers fall somewhere in the middle of the hierarchical stages.

Limitations

Upon final analysis of the study, there were some limitations to consider. The limitations to this study include the following. The perceptions that were gathered from

K-12 public school teachers were only limited to those teachers of the school districts in south Mississippi. Not all schools in this region of Mississippi participated in the study.

The perceptions of teachers were based on their current administration, current school conditions, and current subject area taught. Many teachers asked if their perceptions could be based on previous administration or working conditions. Therefore, teacher opinions were not based on their profession as a whole but limited to the current school year.

Two sections of the survey instrument did not work as scales, teacher intent and intrinsic motivators. Clarity in these two areas was sometimes difficult to attain which resulted in low reliability of the subscales. The Cronbach's alpha section for these two sections was below the researcher's set score of .70. These sections remained in the survey because one of the most critical questions in the survey specifically came from the Teacher Intent section. The researcher recognized that this question could have sufficed as the only question for measuring intent purposes; however, other questions were added to this section in order to gather additional information. Unfortunately, teachers did not know how to respond to this section other than answering their intent to remain in the profession; the same can be said for intrinsic motivators. In looking at intrinsic motivators, as stated previously, it did not work as a scale, but the researcher looked at descriptives subscales in order to identify which factors best described motivation for teachers.

Fewer state-measured subject area teachers completed the survey than non-state-measured subject area teachers. If more state-measured subject area teachers had participated in the survey, results might have reflected a significant difference in teacher

job satisfaction. The majority of teachers in this study represented 11-20 years in the teaching profession, possibly indicating most teachers are too close to retirement to leave the profession.

The study represented teachers who currently teach and does not include perceptions of those teachers who have already left the profession. Attrition rates of those who left the teaching profession in south Mississippi were not calculated. This study specifically focused on principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, and intrinsic motivators.

Importance of the Study to the Field of Educational Leadership

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2007), approximately 25% of the teaching profession leaves within the first three years of teaching, and approximately 21% of the teachers in this study have left and returned to the teaching profession. These findings suggest the importance of leaders and policy makers working together to implement strategies for retaining teachers and preserving the teaching profession. The information presented in this study is important to the field of educational leadership because leaders must realize what is occurring in schools in south Mississippi, as well as in the U.S., with regard to teacher retention. In this study, teacher perceptions provided the researcher with pertinent information regarding the causes of teacher job satisfaction and teacher job dissatisfaction, as noted in Chapter IV. These findings must be assessed critically and carefully by leaders in the field of education in order to maintain better teacher retention rates.

According to teacher perceptions in this study, leaders in the field of education must realize that a key component to retaining teachers in their schools is to have

supportive leadership. Teachers indicated that principals influence their satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the workplace, and principals are a primary reason many teachers choose to remain or leave the teaching profession. Because leaders influence school culture, they must make conscientious efforts to employ fair and equitable practices for all teachers in order to strive for better retention rates. In reviewing what leaders can do to improve retention rates of teachers, teachers suggested that administrative support, manageable workloads, and better student discipline are key factors in retaining teachers. The findings in this study provide leaders with valuable information which contribute to the field of educational leadership.

Recommendations for Leadership, Policies, and Procedures

Teachers choose this profession for different reasons; many enter for stability of the profession, time off, working conditions, salary, and for intrinsic reasons such as wanting to help others grow and succeed (Hughes, 2012). However, in this midst of their teaching careers, some educators become dissatisfied and choose to leave the profession. Ingersoll (2003) found that turnover rates were greater in the teaching profession than other professions. In order to improve upon retention rates in the teaching profession, it is imperative that school administrators and policy makers focus on the factors that influence teachers to leave the profession and make necessary changes to foster better retention rates. Brill and McCartney (2008) suggested that building capacity for teachers, who are committed to student growth and achievement, along with working with schools and communities must be a priority if we want to see improvement in U.S. schools.

Teacher responses clearly indicated that teachers would like to see changes in schools. As one high school, non-state-measured teacher indicated, “Pressure of state

testing, meeting mandated time frames, and decisions made by people who have not been in classrooms,” are the things that bothered him most. His perceptions agreed with many other teachers in the study. A state-measured teacher, who feels the effects of policy makers’ decisions and administrative pressure stated, “Pressure to push, push, push our test scores to go up,” is what bothered her most about the teaching profession. These perceptions indicate that teachers want the ability to go to their classrooms and teach students without worrying about which mandates or reforms will affect them next. Furthermore, teacher responses indicated frustrations when expectations are placed upon them by policy makers who have no classroom experience. Leithwood and McAdie (2007) claimed that policy makers should be aware of the demands they place on teachers because their mandates affect teachers on a daily basis.

In order to better prepare teachers for what is expected of them in today’s classrooms, universities and educational leaders should collaborate and provide education majors with ample opportunities to observe in local schools on a weekly basis. Observations of schools should occur prior to student teaching, so teacher candidates can be better equipped mentally in dealing with the challenges that lie ahead. Furthermore, teaching candidates, experienced classroom teachers, and school leaders should have opportunities to serve on legislative boards that make policies, which impact the teaching profession. According to Barrett (2009), past policies that are pertinent to curriculum decisions are put into place without policy makers understanding the effects of pedagogy in classrooms. Therefore, narrowing of the curriculum occurs in schools, and teachers succumb to the pressures of teaching to the test (Barrett, 2009).

In exploring teacher job satisfaction, it is vital for principals to realize that their leadership behaviors and styles do impact teacher intent as noted previously in this study. When teachers feel a sense of satisfaction and they remain in the profession, the outcome is usually student growth (Cooley & Shen, 2005; Gallagher, 2012). Flynt and Morton (2009) claimed teacher turnover has an effect on student outcomes, and that school leaders need to take a closer look at this problem. Because principals feel pressure to increase student achievement, they add more pressure on teachers to yield high test results (Farber, 2010). These findings support Herzberg's and Maslow's theories on satisfaction as discussed in Chapter II.

Based on the findings in this study, school leaders, administrators, stakeholders, and policy makers need to consider revising the current policy and procedures in place, specifically policies pertaining to state tests and teacher evaluations. If teachers are going to be evaluated based on standardized test results, efforts must be made to make it fairer for all teachers involved. As it is, state-measured teachers are responsible for their students' growth, but non-state-measured teachers are measured on fulfilling teaching objectives in their content framework with a school-wide growth component factored in. The school-wide growth component results in administrators placing more stress on state-measured teachers to produce good test results, thus, creating inequity in schools. Inequities can include additional work hours for state-measured teachers without additional compensation, making this an unfair practice.

Future recommendations would be for state-measured teachers to receive either more planning time during the school day or receive an increase in salary. Although Governor Phil Bryant is proposing merit pay for teachers, some aspects of it are not

far from well with teachers. Governor Bryant is proposing that teachers no longer receive across-the-board pay increases. Instead, he wants to reward those exceptional teachers who demonstrate student growth and performance to receive additional compensation. Merit pay is being proposed in an effort to increase teacher effectiveness in Mississippi (State of Mississippi, Office of the Governor, 2012). As part of state efforts to promote effectiveness in schools, M-Star is being piloted in most schools this year (Mississippi Department of Education, 2013). However, it needs to be reassessed to ensure fairness and equity for all teachers, and school leaders must be well versed in what constitutes equality in schools.

When policy makers drafted the report on M-Star, they added the intended consequence of school-wide growth for all teachers in an attempt to encourage collaboration among state-measured and non-state-measured teachers. When the new evaluation tool goes live next year, school-wide growth will affect all teachers; however, it will still be based on what occurs in state-measured subject area classrooms. Therefore, it must be reviewed for accuracy and fairness in evaluating all teachers in the state of Mississippi, and school leaders should step forward in support of teachers and the teaching profession. These suggestions are aimed to enhance policy makers' and administrators' understanding of how teachers in Mississippi feel about the teaching profession. If the priority is to promote teacher effectiveness and student achievement in schools today, teacher job satisfaction must be addressed in order to retain quality teachers in Mississippi.

Recommendations for Future Research

For future studies, the researcher suggests continued research relevant to the following topics addressed in this study with regard to leadership and high-stakes testing on the retention of teachers:

1. Future studies should include schools located in other regions of Mississippi in order to include a broader range of schools with different demographics, socioeconomic backgrounds, and school ratings.
2. Future studies should explore actual retention rates of teachers in state-measured and non-state-measured subject areas.
3. Future studies should examine only state-measured subject area teacher perceptions in various locations throughout Mississippi in order to get a better understanding of their intent to remain in the teaching profession.
4. Future studies should include conducting qualitative case studies of teachers who have actually left the teaching profession. It is recommended that the researcher identify the percentages of teachers who taught state-measured subject areas and non-state-measured subject areas and what were the contributing factors that led to their attrition.
5. Future studies should include conducting qualitative case studies on teachers who have left the teaching profession in order to determine if principal leadership had a bearing on their decision to leave.
6. Future studies should include a large number of participants in similar proportions from elementary teachers, middle school teachers, and high school teachers. Overall, the sample of participants in this study had fewer

middle school and elementary school participants than high school participants.

7. Future studies should examine whether private school teacher perspectives differ compared to public school teacher perspectives with regard to teacher job satisfaction and intent to remain in the teaching profession.
8. Future studies should examine why more females leave and return to the teaching profession than males do as found in this study.
9. Finally, it is recommended that any future researcher who desires to use the survey instrument included in this study should make revisions to improve clarity of questions and reduce the number of questions asked.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine data collected from K-12 state-measured and non-state-measured subject area teachers in elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools in south Mississippi to determine if principal leadership and high-stakes testing had an effect on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Teachers' perceptions concerning the contributing factors that led to their intent to remain in the teaching profession were also examined. Specific areas of the study included teacher demographics, principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, intrinsic motivators, and self-reported factors. Prior scholarship examined the impact of the aforementioned items on teacher retention, and literature confirmed many of the findings in this research study. Teacher retention rates, as confirmed in previous literature, did not correlate with teachers in this study and their intent to remain in the teaching profession.

When searching for survey instruments to implement in this study, the researcher did not discover any comprehensive survey instruments that encompassed the necessary components addressed in this study. Therefore, the researcher developed all survey questions on the survey instrument in an effort to examine teacher perceptions with regard to teachers' intent and the contributing factors that may lead to intent to remain in the teaching profession. Data were collected from 212 teachers with the majority of teachers being non-state-measured subject area teachers who have been in the teaching profession for a total of 11-20 years. The survey instrument included both quantitative and qualitative portions.

This study specifically examined whether principal leadership styles and behaviors had an impact on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Results confirmed it had a significant impact on teachers' intent based on principal leadership styles and behaviors. It also examined whether there was a difference in state-measured subject area teachers and non-state-measured subject area teachers' levels of teacher job satisfaction. Results indicated there was no difference in their levels of teacher job satisfaction. This study examined whether there was a relationship between teacher job satisfaction, teacher morale, and teacher mentoring programs and teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. Results indicated a significant relationship was found. Self-reported factors were analyzed in the qualitative section of the survey instrument. To ensure participation in this survey, the researcher guaranteed anonymity, so participants could honestly express their perceptions of the teaching profession.

Self-reported factors provided the researcher with robust answers that contributed to the overall significance of this study. These self-reported factors provided the

researcher with pertinent information to make recommendations for policy or practice and recommendations for future research. Both quantitative and qualitative data provided the researcher with invaluable information to share with future researchers who would like to expound up the research found in this study.

APPENDIX A

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION OF SUPERINTENDENTS

Date:

Name of Superintendent:

Name of School District:

District Address:

Dear Superintendent _____:

My name is Amy Thibodeaux, and I am a graduate student at The University of Southern Mississippi in the Educational Leadership doctoral program. I am currently in the process of writing my dissertation and will soon be conducting research in K-12 public schools located in south Mississippi.

The title of my dissertation is *The Effects of Leadership and High-Stakes Testing on the Retention of Teachers*. This study will focus on the contributing factors that lead to a teacher's intent to remain in the teaching profession or leave the teaching profession. Survey topics include teacher characteristics such as age, gender, years of teaching experience, types of certifications, and current teaching status. Additional topics will focus on principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, intrinsic motivators, and self-reported factors that include perceptions of the teaching profession.

I am requesting your permission to conduct this research in one of your elementary, junior high, and high schools. With your permission I will contact the principals of the three schools and coordinate a date and time to distribute surveys to principals or a school designee. Surveys can be conducted after school or during planning periods whichever is more suitable to meeting the accommodations of each faculty.

As a former state-tested teacher, I understand the grueling demands that are placed on teachers each year. With CCSS upon us, I realize that teachers' time and energy are being focused on meeting these standards in order to insure a quality education for children and to meet state and federal mandates. Teacher accountability is at an all-time high, and many teachers are leaving the profession. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to learn more about teacher satisfaction and what makes a teacher remain or leave the profession.

If you have questions about this survey, please contact me by phone: (228) 860-9651 or by email at gagathibodeaux@yahoo.com. My dissertation chair is Dr. David E. Lee, and he may be contacted by phone at (601) 266-4579 or by email at David.E.Lee@usm.edu. This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Southern Mississippi. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the chair of the board at 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001 or by phone at (601) 266-6820.

If you allow me to conduct this research with teachers in your district, please copy and paste the content of the attached consent form to your district letterhead. I will also need your signature and date on the consent form. I would appreciate it if you return the consent form in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. If this is not convenient for you, I will be obliged to pick it up at your earliest convenience.

Your time and participation in this study are appreciated.

Respectfully,

Amy Thibodeaux
Doctoral Candidate, University of Southern Mississippi
Enclosure
CC: Dr. David Lee, Committee Chair

APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM APPROVED BY SUPERINTENDENT:
TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN SPECIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

(Attention Superintendents: Please place this consent form on your school letterhead, so that I may provide evidence of your permission to conduct research in this school district. I will gladly email you a copy of this letter. If you would like a copy, please do not hesitate to email me at gagathibodeaux@yahoo.com)

I, _____, as the current superintendent of the _____ School District, give Amy Krohn Thibodeaux permission to conduct educational research in this district during the spring semester of the 2013-2014 school year.

The research to be conducted will examine teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession. The researcher is studying contributing factors that lead to teacher job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction in public elementary, middle, or high schools. Additionally, the researcher would like to examine whether high-stakes testing or principal leadership has an effect on teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession.

Permission is granted to distribute survey instruments to three schools in this district. I understand that participation is voluntary, and all responses will be completely anonymous and will be kept in a secure area in order to ensure confidentiality. I understand that individuals completing the survey will not be identified in any way, nor will any school or district be identified in the reporting of data. I also understand that I may request a copy of the final report.

Superintendent's Signature

Date of Consent

APPENDIX C

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FOR STUDY

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

118 College Drive #5116 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001

Phone: 601.266.5997 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/research/institutional-review-board**NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION**

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
 - The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
 - The selection of subjects is equitable.
 - Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
 - Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
 - Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
 - Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
 - Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
 - If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.
- Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 13112101

PROJECT TITLE: **The Effects of Leadership and High-Stakes Testing on the Retention of Teachers**PROJECT TYPE: **New Project**RESEARCHER(S): **Amy Thibodeaux**COLLEGE/DIVISION: **College of Education and Psychology**DEPARTMENT: **Educational Leadership and School Counseling**FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: **N/A**IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: **Expedited Review Approval**PERIOD OF APPROVAL: **12/13/2013 to 12/12/2014**

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX D

SURVEY COVER LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

Dear Administrator,

My name is Amy Thibodeaux. I am a graduate student at the University of Southern Mississippi in the Educational Leadership Department. I am currently working on the dissertation phase of my studies, and I am seeking teacher input from your district for my survey. It is greatly needed and appreciated. My dissertation is entitled “The Effects of High-Stakes Testing and Leadership on the Retention of Teachers.”

As a former state-tested teacher of English, I understand the grueling demands that are placed on teachers each year. With CCSS upon us, I realize that teachers are focusing on meeting these standards in order to insure a quality education for children and to meet state and federal mandates. Teacher accountability is at an all-time high, and many teachers are leaving the profession in search of other opportunities. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to learn more about teacher satisfaction and what makes a teacher remain or leave the teaching profession.

I invite your teachers to take 10-15 minutes of their time to complete this survey. Once they have completed it, please contact me via phone or email. My contact information is provided for you in the next paragraph. Please understand that these surveys are completely anonymous. Responses will be used for the purpose of this study and will remain confidential with no respondent or school being identified. Participation is strictly voluntary, and you may withdraw from this study at any time. Information obtained through this survey will be kept in a locked file cabinet by the researcher for no more than three years. It will then be properly disposed of at that time.

Please consider participating in this survey. If you have questions about this survey, please contact me by phone: (228) 860-9651 or by email at gagathibodeaux@yahoo.com. My dissertation chair is Dr. David E. Lee, and he may be contacted by phone at (601) 266-4579 or by email at David.E.Lee@usm.edu. This project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Southern Mississippi. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the chair of the board at 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001 or by phone at (601) 266-6820.

Your time and participation in this study are appreciated.

Respectfully,

Amy Thibodeaux

Doctoral Candidate, University of Southern Mississippi

Enclosure

CC: Dr. David Lee, Committee Chair

APPENDIX E

PANEL OF EXPERT LETTER

Dear Participant,

My name is Amy Thibodeaux, and I am completing a dissertation entitled “The Effects of Leadership and High-Stakes Testing on the Retention of Teachers.” In order to complete my study, I am asking you to become a part of my Panel of Experts. Your expertise in education will provide me with quality feedback on the content validity of my teacher retention survey.

Please read, analyze, and critique each question thoroughly in order to provide me with the necessary information as to the effectiveness of this survey. My goal is to survey teachers of all grade levels and subject areas in order to see what makes them remain in the teaching profession or leave the teaching profession. Upon your completion of the survey, please complete the Validity Questionnaire and return both the completed survey and questionnaire to me at Amy Thibodeaux, 15518 Old Hwy 15, Biloxi, MS 39532, or you may email it to me at gagathibodeaux@yahoo.com. If you prefer that I send you a hard copy of the survey and questionnaire, please let me know, and I will be happy to do so.

Thank you for assisting me in this great endeavor and for sharing your expertise in the field of education.

Sincerely,

Amy Krohn Thibodeaux,
Doctoral Candidate, University of Southern Mississippi

APPENDIX F

VALIDITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher Retention SurveyValidity Questionnaire

Thank you for volunteering your time to assist me in the development of this survey. Your input is very important with respect to the survey itself and the development of my dissertation overall. Your willingness and consideration to participate in this study is greatly appreciated.

Please rate the included survey based on the following information:

1. Does the survey contain language that can be understood by teachers relative to their job satisfaction, leadership behaviors, and intent to remain in the teaching profession?_____

2. Does the survey address specific and appropriate issues in the statements, as it relates to teachers' intent to remain in the teaching profession?

3. Do you find any of the questions offensive or obtrusive?

4. Are there any questions that you would exclude from the survey?

5. Are there any other statements that you would include that are **not** a part of the survey?

6. Please make any other comments or suggestions about the survey below.

APPENDIX G

TEACHER RETENTION SURVEY

Please complete the following survey. This survey is anonymous and will be used for the purpose of the researcher's dissertation. Your input is critical to the validity of the researcher's work. Please be honest in answering all questions.

Before you begin, please answer the consent form below.

Do you voluntarily consent to take this survey and give your permission to the researcher for the use of your answers in her research?

_____ Yes, I voluntarily give my permission to the researcher.

_____ No, I do not voluntarily give my permission to the researcher.

If you answered NO to this survey, please do not proceed.

***Teacher Characteristics**

Teacher Characteristics	Please answer the following questions by circling the correct response.
1. What is your gender?	(1) Male (2) Female
2. What is your age?	(1) 20-29 (2) 30-39 (3) 40-49 (4) 50+
3. Counting this year, how many years have you been teaching?	(1) 1-5 (2) 6-10 (3) 11-20 (4) 21-30 (5) 30+
4. In what type of school do you teach?	(1) Elementary (2) Middle School/Junior High (3) High School
5. What type of certification do you have?	(1) Bachelor's Degree (2) Master's Degree (3) Specialist's Degree (4) Doctoral Degree

6. Are you highly qualified to teach the subject for which you currently teach?	(1) Yes (2) No
7. Are you a National Board Certified teacher?	(1) Yes (2) No
8. If you had the opportunity to go back to college, would you choose the teaching profession again?	(1) I would choose to become a teacher. (2) I would choose a different profession.
9. What is your current teaching position?	(1) State-tested subject area teacher (2) Non-state-tested subject area teacher (3) Special Education Teacher (4) Elective Teacher (Music, art, technology, gifted)

Working Environment Factors

Please rate the following statements by circling the corresponding number with the following representation:

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neutral, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree.

Principal Leadership Behaviors	Please indicate the following strategies as: 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree
10. Administrators treat all teachers fairly.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
11. Administrators value teacher input and allow teachers to make key decisions.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
12. Administrators take an active role in the learning process and assist teachers in ways to improve instruction.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

13. Teachers feel supported, respected, and appreciated by administrators.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
14. Teachers at this school have time to collaborate with department members during the school day.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
15. Administrators place more pressure on state-tested subject area teachers.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Teacher Intention	Please indicate the following strategies as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree 				
16. I plan to remain in the teaching profession next year.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
17. I plan to remain in this profession, but I will move to a different school.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
18. I plan on moving into administration within the next year or two.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
19. I plan to remain in the teaching profession next year, but I plan to teach a different grade level and/or subject area.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
20. I would stay in this profession if I did not teach a state-tested subject area.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Teacher Job Satisfaction	Please indicate the following strategies as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree 				
21. I do not feel appreciated by students and their parents.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
22. I feel appreciated by my colleagues.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

23. I am individually recognized for a job well done.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
24. I am not pleased with my salary.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
25. I am experiencing burnout in this profession.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
26. I am satisfied with the subject area in which I teach.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
27. I am not satisfied with the amount of hours I work each week.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
28. The pressure of high-stakes testing lends itself to burnout in this profession.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
29. I am encouraged to take an active role in decisions regarding the school, including instructional goals.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
30. I am rewarded throughout the school year for a job well done.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
31. I am provided with a system that allows me to express my concerns openly without fear of consequences.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
32. I have low morale.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
33. Teachers at this school have high morale.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Teacher Mentoring	Please indicate the following strategies as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree 				
34. New teachers are mentored in a way that helps them grow professionally.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
35. Teachers new to this school are not provided with necessary supplies to get them started in their classrooms.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
36. This district has an induction program for new teachers, and principals are supportive of new teachers.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
37. Teachers in this district are given first preference on new job openings.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Intrinsic Motivators	Please indicate the following strategies as: 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree				
38. I enjoy challenges that require my students to perform at a higher level.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
39. Teaching children at this age level is rewarding to me.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
40. Monetary incentives do not motivate me to become a better teacher.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
41. Rewards by my administrators make me strive to work harder.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Self-reported Factors

42. Which factor contributes greatest to a teacher's wanting to remain in the teaching profession? _____

43. Which factor contributes greatest to a teacher's wanting to leave the teaching profession? _____

44. Have you ever left the teaching profession? A. Yes B. No

If so, please provide an explanation.

45. If a college student asked you the primary reason to become a teacher, what would you say?

46. During a typical teaching day, what bothers you the most about this profession?

Please list three items.

- ---
- ---
- ---

APPENDIX H
RESPONDENT SURVEY COVER LETTER

Dear Fellow Educator,

My name is Amy Thibodeaux. I am a graduate student at the University of Southern Mississippi in the Educational Leadership Department. I am currently working on the dissertation phase of my studies, and I am seeking your input for my survey. It is greatly needed and appreciated. My dissertation is entitled “The Effects of High-Stakes Testing and Leadership on the Retention of Teachers.”

As a former state-tested teacher, I understand the grueling demands that are placed on you each year. With CCSS upon us, I realize that your time and energy are being focused on meeting these standards in order to insure a quality education for children and to meet state and federal mandates. Teacher accountability is at an all-time high, and many teachers are leaving the profession. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to learn more about teacher satisfaction and what makes a teacher remain or leave the profession.

I invite you to take 10-15 minutes to complete this survey. Once you have completed it, please return it to your contact person who will place it in a large manila envelope and return it to me. Responses will be used for the purpose of this study and will remain confidential with no respondent being identified. Participation is strictly voluntary, and you may withdraw from this study at any time. Information obtained through this survey will be kept in a locked file cabinet by the researcher for no more than three years. It will then be properly disposed of at that time.

Please consider participating in this survey. If you have questions about this survey, please contact me by phone: (228) 860-9651 or by email at gagathibodeaux@yahoo.com. My dissertation chair is Dr. David E. Lee, and he may be contacted by phone at (601) 266-4579 or by email at David.E.Lee@usm.edu. This project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Southern Mississippi. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the chair of the board at 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001 or by phone at (601) 266-6820.

Your time and participation in this study are appreciated.

Respectfully,

Amy Thibodeaux

Doctoral Candidate, University of Southern Mississippi
Enclosure
CC: Dr. David Lee, Committee Chair

APPENDIX I
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTION SHEET

Answers to Frequently Asked Questions:

(For the purpose of this survey)

- This survey is for teachers only- not administrators because the topic is *Teacher Retention*.
- Teachers may provide only ONE answer.
- This survey applies to the current school (where the teacher is teaching NOW).
- State-tested teachers are those who are responsible for MCT2 scores or SATP scores.
 - Grades 3-8 (Reading, English, Math)
 - 5th Grade Science Teacher
 - 8th Grade Science Teacher
 - SATP (English II, Algebra I, Biology I, and U.S. History)
- If a teacher is an inclusion teacher, but co-teaches in a state-measured subject area, the inclusion teacher must mark inclusion teacher (sped). According to the school/state department, the subject-area teacher is primarily responsible for the state-test scores-unless otherwise noted at your school. If a teacher is responsible for state-test scores and is an inclusion teacher, then the teacher will mark state-tested subject area teacher.
- Some of the questions on the survey have the word **NOT** in them, and this is so teachers actually read and answer the questions (per advice from the researcher's statistician/methodologist).

REFERENCES

- Achieve and U.S. Education Delivery Institute. (2013). Implementing common core state standards and assessments. Retrieved from http://www.parcconline.org/sites/parcc/files/Common_Core_Workbook.pdf
- ACT. (2013). *Our story*. Retrieved from <http://www.act.org/about-us/our-story/>
- Adiele, E. E., & Abraham, N. M. (2013). Achievement of Abraham Maslow's needs hierarchy theory among teachers: Implications for human resource management in the secondary school system in rivers state. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 2(1), 140-144. doi:10:5430/jct.v2n1p140
- Aydin, A., Sarier, Y., & Uysal, S. (2013). The effect of school principals' leadership styles on teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(2), 806-810. Retrieved from <http://connection.ebscohost.com>
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28, 117-148. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/scholar>
- Barrett, B. (2009). No Child Left Behind and the assault on teachers' professional practices and identities. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 25(8), 1018-1025. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

- Bass, B. M. (1991). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berry, B., & Fuller, E., Williams, A. (2007). *Stemming the tide of teacher attrition: How working conditions influence teacher career intentions and other key outcomes in Arizona*. Chapel Hill, NC: Center for Teaching Quality. Retrieved from <http://www.teachingquality.org>
- Boe, E., Cook, L., & Sunderland, R. (2008). Teacher turnover: Examining exit attrition, teaching area transfer, and school migration. *Exceptional Children*, 75(1), 7-31.
- Bouchard, E.D., Cervone, L., Hayden, H., Riggins-Newby, C. G., & Zarlengo, P. (2002). *Chronicles: A history of the development of the principal's leadership network: Addressing the leadership challenges faced by principals*. (Contract No. ED-01-CO-0010). Alexandria, VA: Brown University.
- Boyd, D. J., Grossman, P. L., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. H. (2009). *The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions* (Working Paper No. 25). Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/1001287_calderworkingpaper25.pdf

- Brill, S., & McCartney, A. (2008). Stopping the revolving door: Increasing teacher retention. *Politics and Policy*, 36(5), 750-774. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Brown, K.M., & Wynn, S.R. (2009). Finding, supporting, and keeping: The role of the principal in teacher retention issues. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8, 37-63. doi:10.1080/15700760701817371
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Burns, L. (2007). On being unreasonable: NCTE, CEE, and political action. *English Education*, 39(2), 120-145. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40173344>
- Byrd-Blake, M., Afolayan, M., Hunt, J., Fabunmi, M., Pryor, B., & Leander, R. (2010). Morale of teachers in high poverty schools: A post-NCLB mixed methods analysis. *Education and Urban Society*, 42, 450-472. Retrieved from <http://eus.sagepub.com/content/42/4/450>
- Cannon, S. (2013). Building on Maslow to meet director and staff needs. *Exchange*, 211, 8-11. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., and Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 473-490. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001
- Center for Teaching Quality. (2006). *Spotlight: Teacher working conditions*. Retrieved from www.teachingquality.org/twc/main.htm
- Center on Education Policy. (2009, November). *State high school exit exams: Trends in test programs, alternate pathways, and pass rates*. Washington, DC: Author.

- Chapman, D., & Green, M. (1986). Teacher retention: a further examination. *Journal of Educational Research*, 79(5), 273-279. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1987-29497-001>
- Clement, M. C. (2000). *Building the best faculty*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Cannady, M., McEachern, K. P., Piazza, P., Power, C., & Ryan, A. (2011). Teachers' education, teaching practice, and retention: A cross-genre review of recent research. *Journal of Education*, 191(2), 19-31. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Common Core State Standards (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/other-resources/>
- Cooley, V. E., & Shen, J. (2005). School accountability and principals' professional job responsibilities. In J. Shen (Ed.), *School Principals* (pp. 61-79). Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Curtis, C. (2012). Why do they choose to teach- and why do they leave? A study of middle school and high school mathematics teachers. *Education*, 132(4), 779-788. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 6-13. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). The flat earth and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future, *Educational Researcher*, 36, 318-334. doi: 10.3102/0013189X07308253

- Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2007). A good teacher in every classroom: Preparing the highly-qualified teachers our children deserve. *Educational Horizons*, 85(2), 111-132. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/>
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (2006). Highly-qualified teachers for all. *Educational Leadership*, 64(3), 14-20. Retrieved from <http://www.csun.edu/>
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (2003). Wanted: A national teacher supply policy for education: The right way to meet the “Highly Qualified Teacher” challenge. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11(33). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n33/>
- Dartey-Baah, K. (2011). Application of Frederick Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory in assessing and understanding employee motivation at work: A Ghanaian Perspective. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(9), 1-8. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/scholar>
- David, J. (2011). High-stakes testing narrows the curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, 68(6), 78-80. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Davis, S. H., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Innovative principal preparation programs: What works and how we know. *Planning and Changing*, 43(1/2), 25-45. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2009). Veteran teachers: commitment, resilience and quality retention. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15, 441-457.
doi: 10.1080/13540600903057211

- Dolezalek, H. (2008). *Standardized Testing in Schools*. Edina, MN: ABDO Publishing Company.
- Dresser, R. (2012). The impact of scripted literacy instruction on teachers and students. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 21(1), 71-87. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/>
- Farber, K. (2010). *Why great teachers quit and how we might stop the exodus*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Fatima, Q. (2012). A study of the effectiveness of socio-economics conditions on job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 2(1), 259-266. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Feng, L. (2005). *Hire today, gone tomorrow: The determinants of attrition among public school teachers* (Report No. 589). Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED493836>
- Finnigan, K., & Gross, B. (2007). Do accountability policy sanctions influence teacher motivation? Lessons from Chicago's low-performing school. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 594-629. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1802/21319>
- Flynt, S. W., & Morton, R. C. (2009). The teacher shortage in America: Pressing concerns. *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal*, 19(3), 1-5. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalforum.com>
- Gallagher, M. (2012). How principals support teacher effectiveness. *Leadership*, 41(3), 32- 37. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>

- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Goble, F. (1970). *The third force: The psychology of Abraham Maslow*. New York, NY: Grossman Publishers.
- Goldstein, R. A., & Beutel, A. R. (2009). 'Soldier of democracy' or 'enemy of the state'? The rhetorical construction of teacher through No Child Left Behind. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 7(1), 275-300. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Grady, M.L. (1990). The teaching principal. *Research in Rural Education*, 6(3), 49-52.
- Greenlee, B., & Brown, J. (2009). Retaining teachers in challenging times. *Education*, 130(1), 96-109. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Grier, T.B., & Holcombe, A.A. (2008). Mission possible. *Educational Leadership*, 65(7), 25-30. Retrieved from <http://www1.gcsnc.com/>
- Haberman, M. (2005). *Star teachers: The ideology and best practice of effective teachers of diverse children and youth in poverty*. Houston, TX: The Haberman Educational Foundation.
- Hahs-Vaughn, D., & Scherff, L. (2008). Beginning English teacher attrition, mobility, and retention. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 77, 21-53.
doi: 10.3200/JEXE.77.1.21-54

- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-352 .
Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Hancock, C., & Scherff, L. (2010). Who will stay and who will leave? Predicting secondary English teacher attrition risk. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 328-338. doi: 10.1177/0022487110372214
- Hanson, S., & Moir, E. (2008). Beyond mentoring: Influencing the professional practice and careers of experienced teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(6), 453-458.
Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 65(5), 109-120. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost>
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hughes, G.D. (2012). Teacher retention: Teacher characteristics, school characteristics, organizational characteristics, and teacher efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 105, 245-255. doi: 10.1080/00220671.2011.584922
- Ingersoll, R. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages. An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Ingersoll, R. (2003). The teacher shortage: Myth or reality? *Educational Horizons*, 81(3), 146-152. Retrieved from <http://elearningspace.us/>

- Ingersoll, R. (2004). *Why do high-poverty schools have difficulty staffing their classrooms with qualified teachers?* Retrieved from <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/>
- Ingersoll, R. (2012). Beginning teacher induction: what the data tell us. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(8), 47-51. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Ingersoll, R. & Smith, T. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30-33. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Ingersoll, R. & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Education Research*, 81(2), 201-233. Retrieved from <http://repository.upenn.edu/>
- Jackson, K. (2012). Influence matters: The link between principal and teacher influence over school policy and teacher turnover. *Journal of School Leadership*, 22(5), 875-901. Retrieved from <http://rowman.com/Page/Journals>
- Jacobson, L. (2007). Study looks at California teacher retention. *Education Week*, 26(35), 17-19. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Jensen, E. (2013). How poverty affects classroom engagement. *Educational Leadership*, 70(8), 24-30. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Johnson, S. (2006). The workplace matters: Teacher quality, retention, and effectiveness. Washington, DC: *National Education Association*. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org>

- Johnsrud, L., & Rosser, V. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 518-542.
doi:10.1353/jhe.2002.0039
- Johnston, G. P. (1990). Best liked/least liked teacher attributes: Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction. *Journal of Education for Business*, 66(2), 121-125.
Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Jung, D. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13(2), 185-195. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Jung, D., & Avolio, B. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(8), 949-964.
Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/>
- Kaback, S. (2006). High stakes are for tomatoes: Supporting teachers and students when the growing conditions are poor. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 42(3), 101-103.
Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Kafka, J. (2009). The principalship in historical perspective. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 84, 318-330. doi:10.1080/01619560902973506
- Kang, S., & Berliner, D. (2012). Characteristics of teacher induction programs and turnover rates of beginning teachers. *Teacher Educator*, 47(4), 268-282.
Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>

- Kipps-Vaughan, D. (2013). Supporting teachers through stress management. *Education Digest*, 79(1), 43-46. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Knox, J.A., & Anfara, V. A. (2013). Understanding job satisfaction and its relationship to student academic performance. *Middle School Journal*, 44(3), 58-64. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Kohn, A. (2000). Standardized testing and its victims. *Education Week*, 20(4), 46-47. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/scholar>
- Kopkowski, C. (2008). Why they leave. *NEA Today*, 26(7), 21-25. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/home/12630.htm>
- Kumi-Yeboah, A., & James, W. (2012). Transformational teaching experience of a novice teacher. *Adult Learning*, 23, 170-177. doi: 10.1177/1045159512457354
- LaMorte, M. (2008). *School law: Cases and concepts*. (9th Ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Lee, L. (2011). What did the teachers think? Teachers' responses to the use of value-added modeling as a tool for evaluating teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*, 7, 97-103. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Leithwood, K., & McAdie, P. (2007, Spring). Teacher working conditions that matter. *Education Canada*, 7(1), 9-12. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>

- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Division A of the American Educational Research Association.
Retrieved from <http://csuphd.pbworks.com/>
- Longo, C. (2010). Fostering creativity or teaching to the test? Implications of state testing on the delivery of science instruction. *Clearing House*, 83(2), 54-57.
Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu>
- Lynch, J. M. (2012). Responsibilities of today's principal: Implications for principal preparation programs and principal certification policies. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 40-47. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu>
- Manassero, M. A., Buades, E. G., Torrens, G., Ramis, C., Vazquez, A., & Ferrer, V. (2006). Teacher burnout: Attributional aspects. *Psychology in Spain*, 10(1), 66-74.
- Mancuso, S., Roberts, L., & White, G. (2010). Teacher retention in international schools: The key role of school leadership. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 9, 306-323. doi: 10.1177/1475240910388928
- Manuel, J., & Hughes, J. (2006). It has always been my dream: Exploring pre-service teachers; motivations for choosing to teach. *Teacher Development*, 10(1), 5-24.
Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu>
- Marks, L. (2012). In practice: Community service scholarship programs provide meaningful engagement for low-income students. *About Campus*, 16, 29-32. doi: 10.1002/abc.20085

- Marvel, J., Lyter, D., Peltola, P., Strizek, G., & Morton, B. (2006). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2004-05 Teacher Follow-up Survey*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Marzano, R. (2007). *The art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development [ASCD].
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works. From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development [ASCD].
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- McKenzie, K.B. & Locke, L. (2009). Becoming a leader for equity and excellence: It starts with instruction. In S. Douglass Horsford (Ed.), *New perspectives in educational leadership: Exploring social, political, and community contexts and meaning* (pp. 27-58). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- McKenzie, K., & Locke, L. (2014). Distributed leadership: A good theory, but what if leaders won't or don't know how to lead? *Journal of School Leadership*, 24(1).
- McKinney, S., Berry, R., Dickerson, D., & Campbell-Whately, G. (2007). Addressing urban high-poverty school teacher attrition by addressing urban high-poverty school teacher retention: why effective teachers persevere. *Educational Research and Review*, 3(1), 1-9. Retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/ERR>

- McMurrer, J. (2007). *Choices, changes, and challenges: Curriculum and instruction in the NCLB era*. Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy. Retrieved from <http://www.cep-dc.org/>
- Mendels, P. (2012). The effective principal. *Journal of Staff Development*, 33(1), 54-58. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Mendels, P., & Mitgang, L.D. (2013). Creating strong principals. *Educational Leadership*, 70(7), 22-29. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- MetLife Survey of the American Teacher. (2013). *Challenges for School Leadership: A survey of teachers and principals*. New York, NY: MetLife. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov>
- Mihans, R. (2009). Can teachers lead teachers? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74(5), 22-25. Retrieved from www.eddigest.com
- Miller, K.W., & Davison, D. M. (2006). What makes a secondary school science and/or mathematics teacher “highly qualified?” *Science Educator*, 15(1), 56-59. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Mississippi Department of Education. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/>
- Mississippi Department of Education. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/>
- Mississippi Department of Education. (2012). *2012-2013 Guidance for local school district plans for highly qualified teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/>

- Mississippi Department of Education. (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/>
- Mississippi Legislature. (2014). Retrieved from <http://www.legislature.ms.gov/>
- Moon, T. R., Brighton, C. M., Jarvis, J. M., & Hall, C. J. (2007). *State standardized testing programs: Their effects on teachers and students* (RM07228). Storrs, CT: The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut
- Moore, C. M. (2012). The role of school environment in teacher dissatisfaction among U. S. public school teachers. *Sage Open*, 2, 1-16.
doi: 10.1177/2158244012438888
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2007). *Changing role of the middle level and high school leader: Learning from the past-Preparing for the future*. Retrieved from <http://www.nassp.org/portals/0/content/55304.pdf>
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2013). Retrieved from <http://nbpts.org/>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1992). *Characteristics of at-risk students in NELS:88*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs92/92042.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2004-2005 teacher follow-up survey*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007307.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2008-2009 teacher follow-up survey*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform: A report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Retrieved from http://datacenter.spps.org/uploads/sotw_a_nation_at_risk_1983.pdf
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2007). *The high cost of teacher turnover*. Retrieved from <http://www.nctaf.org>
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2010). *Who will teach? Experience matters*. Retrieved from <http://www.nctaf.org>
- Natriello, G., & Pallas, A. (1999). *The development and impact of high stakes testing*. (Report No. 443871). Washington, DC: Government Print Office. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED443871.pdf>
- Nielson, D., Barry, A., & Addison, A. (2006). A model of a new-teacher induction program and teacher perceptions of beneficial components. *Action in Teacher Education*, 28(4), 14-24, Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml>
- Noell, N. H. (1976). *Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction*. (Report No. 004048). Virginia: National Technical Information Service.

OECD (2005). *Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers—Final report:*

Teachers matter. Paris, France: OECD.

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction: State of Washington. (2013). Retrieved

from <http://www.k12.wa.us/esea/>

Pedulla, J.J., Abrams, L.M., Madaus, G.F., Russell, M.K., Ramos, M.A., & Miao, J.

(2003). Perceived effects of state-mandated testing programs on teaching and

learning: Findings from a national survey of teachers. *National Board on*

Educational Testing and Public Policy. Retrieved from [http://www.](http://www.bc.edu/research/nbetpp/statements/nbr2.pdf)

[bc.edu/research/nbetpp/statements/nbr2.pdf](http://www.bc.edu/research/nbetpp/statements/nbr2.pdf)

Perrachione, B., Petersen, G., & Rosser, V. (2008). Why do they stay? Elementary

teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *The Professional Educator,*

32(2). Retrieved from <http://www.theprofessionaleducator.org/>

Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors:

The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal,*

49(2), 327-340. Retrieved from [http://ehis.ebscohost.com/login.lynx.lib.usm.](http://ehis.ebscohost.com/login/lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/)

[edu/ehost/](http://ehis.ebscohost.com/login/lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/)

Pierce, P.R. (1935). *The origin and development of the public school principalship.*

Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Poston, B. (2009, August). An exercise in personal exploration: Maslow's hierarchy of

needs. *The Surgical Technologist, 41*(8), 374-353. Retrieved from

<http://www.astd2007.ast.org/publications/>

- Prather-Jones, B. (2011). How school administrators influence the retention of teachers of students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *The Clearing House*, 84(1), 1-8. doi: 10.1080/00098655.2010.489387
- Prout, S. (2009). Policy, practice and the 'revolving classroom door': Examining the relationship between Aboriginal spatiality and the mainstream education system. *Journal of Education*, 53(1), 39-53. Retrieved from <http://aed.sagepub.com/content/53/1/39>
- Pucella, T. (2011). The impact of National Board Certification on burnout levels in educators. *The Clearing House*, 84, 52-58. doi: 10.1080/00098655.2010.511306
- Rebore, R. (2011). Human resources administration in education: A management approach. (9th Ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Reeves, D. (2000). The 90/90/90 Schools: A case study. *Accountability in action: A blueprint for learning organizations*. Denver, CO: Advanced Learning Press.
- Robertson, M., Hancock, D., & Allen, L.A. (2006). Why novice teachers leave. *Principal Leadership*, 6(8), 33-36. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/>
- Robinson, V.M.J., Lloyd, C.C., & Rowe, K.J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674. doi: 0013161X08321509
- Rousmaniere, K. (2007). Go to the principal's office: Toward a social history of the school principal in North America. *History of Education Quarterly*, 47(1), 1-22. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/login/lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>

- Rubin, D. (2011). The disheartened teacher: Living in the age of standardisation, high-stakes assessments, and No Child Left Behind (NCLB). *Changing English*, 18, 407-416. doi.org./10.1080/1358684X.2011.630197
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1020
- Sass, D. A., Flores, B. B., Claeys, L., & Perez, B. (2012). Identifying personal and contextual factors that contribute to attrition rates for Texas Public School Teachers. *Education policy Analysis Archives*, 20(15), 1-25. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Sawchuk, S. (2012). Principals criticized on teacher-retention decisions. *Education Week*, 31(37), 17. Retrieved from www.edweek.org
- Schaeffer, B. (2012). Resistance to high-stakes testing spreads. *District Administration*, 48(8), 34-42. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Scherer, M. (2012). The challenge of supporting new teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 18-23. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Schneider, K. (2012, Spring). *How teacher retention has been impacted by increased mandates and demands*. Paper presented at the meeting of EDAD 9550 Symposium on School Leadership, Nebraska.

- Schwarzer, R., & Suhair, H. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology, 57*, 152-171.
doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00359.x
- Smethem, L. (2007). Retention and intention in teaching careers: Will the new generation stay? *Teachers and Teaching, 13*, 465-480. doi:10.1080/13540600701561661
- Smith, J., & Kovacs, P. (2011). The impact of standards-based reform on teachers: The case of 'No Child Left Behind'. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 17*, 201-225. doi:10.1080/13540602.2011.539802
- Smith, T., Desimone, L., & Ueno, K. (2005). "Highly qualified" to do what? The relationship between NCLB teacher quality mandates and the use of reform-oriented instruction in middle school mathematics. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 27*, 75-109. doi: 10.3102/01623737027001075
- Sosik, J. J., & Dionne, S. D. (1997). Leadership styles and Deming's behavior factors. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 11*(4), 447-462. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *The Educational Forum, 69*, 143-150.
doi: 10.1080/00131720508984678
- Spradlin, T., & Prendergast, K. (2006). Emerging trends in teacher recruitment and retention in the No Child Left Behind era. *Center for Evaluation and Education Policy, 4*(12), 1-16. Retrieved from <http://www.ceep.indiana.edu>
- State of Mississippi, Office of the Governor. (2012). Effective teachers and performance pay: A recommendation for Mississippi's Performance Compensation System. Retrieved from <http://www.governorbryant.com>

- Strom, P., Strom, R., & Beckert, T. (2011). Examining stakeholder expectations for guiding school reform: including students. *American Secondary Education*, 39(3), 5- 16.
- Supovitz, J. (2010). Is high-stakes testing working? @Penn GSE A Review of Research, 7(2), 3-8. Retrieved from <http://www.gse.upenn.edu/review/feature/supovitz>
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Office of Education. (1969). Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED033459.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *Personnel (in full time equivalency of assignment) employed to provide special education and related services for children with disabilities*. Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS). Retrieved from <http://www.ideadata.org>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Engaging stakeholders: Including parents and the community to sustain improved reading outcomes*. Retrieved from [http:// www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/stakeholderlores.pdf](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/stakeholderlores.pdf)
- U.S. Department of Education. (2013). *Facts about the teaching profession for a national conversation about teaching*. Retrieved from www.ed.gov/documents/respect/teaching-profession-facts.doc
- Valli, L., & Buese, D. (2007). The changing roles of teachers in an era of high-stakes accountability. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44, 519-558.
doi: 10.3102/000283/207306859

- Vandenberghe, R., & Huberman, A. H. (1999). *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace Foundation. (2012). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/>
- Ward, M., & Wilcox, B. (1999). *Delegation & empowerment: Leadings with and through others*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Watlington, E., Shockley, R., Guglielmino, P., & Felsher, R. (2010). The high cost of leaving: an analysis of the cost of teacher turnover. *Journal of Education Finance*, 36(1), 22-37. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Wills, J., & Sandholtz, J. (2009). Constrained professionalism: Dilemmas of teaching in the face of test-based accountability. *Teachers College Record*, 111(4), 1065-1114.
- Yost, D. (2006). Reflection and self-efficacy: Enhancing the retention of qualified teachers from a teacher education perspective. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(4), 59-76. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/>
- Zimmerman, B., & Paul, D. (2007). Technical communication teachers as mentors in the classroom: extending an invitation to students. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16, 175-200. doi: 10.1207/s15427625tcq1602_2